

in the way of new law to prohibit a repetition of such statements; nor is there anything in the statutes or the naval regulations, so far as I am informed, to prevent the recurrence of such a disgraceful incident as took place during the World War, before our entry into it, when Admiral Sims, then a rear admiral of the United States Navy, made a speech at a banquet in London which was properly taken in Germany and countries allied with Germany at that time, when we were supposed to be a neutral, as a violation of our neutrality and a direct declaration of sympathy on the part of the United States with one set of belligerents.

I repeat that while the amendment is subject to the point of order, as I well recognize, the time will come, and I hope the time will come speedily, when the Navy Department and the War Department will not be permitted to conduct the international affairs of the United States and deliberately precipitate conditions which might lead to war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from South Carolina to make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Anning S. Prall, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1935. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Second Lt. Christian Frederick Dreyer, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be captain

First Lt. Don Gilmore Shingler, Corps of Engineers, from May 17, 1935.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Thomas Lawson Thurlow, Air Corps, from May 17, 1935.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Harry Dumont Offutt, Medical Corps, from May 17, 1935.

Maj. George Davies Chunn, Medical Corps, from May 18, 1935.

Maj. Charles Mallon O'Connor, Medical Corps, from May 19, 1935.

Maj. Augustus Benjamin Jones, Medical Corps, from May 20, 1935.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Robert Hilliard Mills, Dental Corps, from May 17, 1935.

Lt. Col. Frank Leonard Kemner Laflamme, Dental Corps, from May 19, 1935.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art the light for morning, the light for noonday, and the light for eventide, breathe upon us every fragment of divine influence. Send us forth with visions of truth, with meditations of duty, and with musings of principles that have rights of authority. We pray Thee to enable us to keep alive the plants in our souls' garden, by prayer and supplication, striving eagerly to bring forward the lagging virtues of our spiritual natures. Come, Holy Spirit, lest we faintly hear the call of responsibility and dimly see the way of wisdom. Be Thou the guest of our souls and their sweetest refreshment. Cleanse that which is sordid, heal that which is wounded, blend that which is stubborn, guide that which is wandering, and grant us final salvation and everlasting joy. In the name of the world's Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1935:

H. R. 4442. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

On May 15, 1935:

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric-light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co. and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes.

On May 17, 1935:

H. R. 6718. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

On May 20, 1935:

H. R. 3808. An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow it may be in order to call bills on the Private Calendar under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that calls for an objection, then. If the gentleman would wait a minute we might get the objection out of the way.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, if the gentleman is going to call for the regular order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I object, then, Mr. Speaker. However we might have had an understanding with the majority leader [Mr. TAYLOR] had the regular order not been called for whereby we might have been able to take up the Private Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to call up bills on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ascertain from the gentleman from Colorado if it is the intention to commence calling bills on the Consent Calendar where we left off on last Monday. Does not the gentleman think that is right and proper, in view of the fact that there are a great many bills that have not yet been called? I hope the gentleman will amend his request to ask permission to start where we stopped on last Monday afternoon.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, whatever the rules of the House provide.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That can be done by unanimous consent. Of course, the rules of the House provide that we start at the beginning of the calendar, but I am asking the gentleman to amend his unanimous-consent request by asking that we start where we finished last Monday. That is nothing but right and proper. It gives Members who have bills on the calendar which have not yet been called an opportunity to have them called and considered.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have it made clear just what effect the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia would have on the request made by the majority leader.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to starting where we left off.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman's request would be reasonable were it not for the fact that certain objections were made which were captious. Certain objections were made to certain bills to which there really was no serious objection. I had one case where the Member who objected came to me and said he was willing to withdraw the objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not going to take the position that any Member makes objection for some captious reason. I presume he has some substantial and valid reason to object to a bill. It is not fair to other Members who have bills on the calendar further down to start at the beginning again.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman will admit that the rules of the House so provide, and the gentleman is asking that the rule be set aside in his favor.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not in my favor. I have no bill on the calendar at all that I personally am interested in.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am willing to withhold objection if the gentleman is willing to start calling the bills under the rules of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That means that we will start where we started last Monday. I think it is only fair to start with Calendar No. 142, where we left off last, and run through the calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I understand there are only three or four bills ahead of where we stopped, so it does not really make much difference where we start.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman let it go through, then?

Mr. GREENWOOD. With the explanation that has been made, with the understanding that I am going to ask unanimous consent to take up a bill to which there was no serious objection, but the objector came to me and said he had no objection to the bill but simply made a captious objection, I will agree to the unanimous-consent request, but I am going to make a unanimous-consent request to return to that bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And I hope the gentleman will be able to obtain it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall not object to the gentleman's request, but I would like to ask if it will be in order, provided this consent is granted and the Speaker is willing, for a Member to be recognized to move to suspend the rules and pass bills on the calendar without getting unanimous consent?

Mr. SNELL. That was not contained in the gentleman's request.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman will add that to his request?

Mr. McFARLANE. I am against that.

Mr. RANKIN. Why?

Mr. McFARLANE. I think we ought to take up the Private Calendar tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to object to that.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi, the Chair states that the Chair would not be disposed to recognize anybody to move to suspend the rules if the request of the gentleman from Colorado that the Consent Calendar be considered is granted, even if the question of suspension were included in the request.

Mr. RANKIN. The information I desired, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not, if the request is granted, we also will have suspensions tomorrow.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado again state his request?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request by asking also that the Speaker may have the same right on tomorrow to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules that he would have on any regular suspension day.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I will object to that. Suspension day is an institution in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the House that we have been disappointed in several committees not having ready for consideration a number of important bills, and unless we can take up one of these calendars tomorrow the House will have nothing before it. I feel that, with hundreds of bills pending on the two calendars, we ought not to adjourn over tomorrow and do nothing.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Colorado will so modify his request that the Private Calendar also may be taken up under the rules with the understanding that no omnibus bills will be considered tomorrow I do not think there will be objection. It was the omnibus bills which Members did not want taken up tomorrow.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TRUAX. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that certain Members of this House have been studying and analyzing the bills on both the Private Calendar and the Consent Calendar. Last Monday we considered something like 100 bills, and they were acted on by the House.

The Members who have been designated to study these measures have not had time to go into the bills that will be considered tomorrow if these requests are granted. I think it is manifestly unfair to ask for the consideration of these bills tomorrow when no preparation or study of the bills has been made.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, several times I have asked for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado again state his request?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my last request was that on tomorrow it may be in order to consider bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am willing that bills on the Consent Calendar be considered, but I am not willing for bills to be considered under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Suspensions were not included, as the Chair understood the gentleman's request.

Mr. SNELL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that on tomorrow it may be in order to consider bills on the Consent Calendar under the rules of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of bills on the Consent

Calendar the call shall commence where we finished on the last Consent Calendar day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, upon what subject is the gentleman from Mississippi going to speak?

Mr. RANKIN. Primarily, on the subject of power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and following the gentleman from Mississippi, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on one or two rules from that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. There is a special order pending. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's text going to be?

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to explain a request to insert in the RECORD certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a very important and interesting brief from the chamber of commerce of my city with the request that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the House the cruelty of listening to me making another textile speech, which I would have to do if this request is not granted, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein as a part of my speech the brief presented by the chamber of commerce of the city of New Bedford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request to make, and I may say that I make this request only after conference with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and with the understanding that he will not lose the opportunity to make his speech today, and believing it will only take a few minutes to dispose of the bill I have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Acad-

emy. There are three amendments to this bill which have been recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2105 (Rept. No. 982)

An act to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter there shall be allowed at the United States Military Academy 3 cadets for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, 5 for the District of Columbia, and 132 from the United States at large, in addition to the number now authorized to be appointed from the enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard and the sons of deceased officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "Rico", insert "one to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, from among the sons of civilians of the Panama Canal Zone and the Panama Railroad, resident on the Zone."

On page 2, line 3, after the word "large", insert "40 of whom shall be appointed on the recommendation of the academic authorities of the honor schools as designated by the War Department"; and on page 2, after line 9, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to call to active service annually, with their consent upon application to and selection by the War Department, for a period of not more than 1 year for any one officer, not to exceed at any time 1,200 Reserve officers of the combatant arms, Ordnance, and the Chemical Warfare Service for active duty with the Regular Army: *Provided*, That members of the Officers' Reserve Corps so called to active service shall be distributed as nearly as may be practicable among the said combatant arms, Ordnance, and Chemical Warfare Service in proportion to the commissioned strength of such arms and service and shall be apportioned in grades therein so far as possible as follows: Not to exceed 5 percent in the field grade, 15 percent in the grade of captain, 30 percent in the grade of first lieutenant, and 50 percent in the grade of second lieutenant: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall affect the number of Reserve officers that may be called to active duty under existing laws, nor the conditions under and purposes for which they may be called.

"The President is hereby and further authorized to commission annually in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, upon application to and selection by the War Department, from among those in all grades who have served 1 year with the Regular Army under the prior provisions of this act, not to exceed 75 officers annually who shall take rank from the date of their permanent commissions in the Regular Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit today during the session of the House in order to conclude the T. V. A. hearings now being held by that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL 938 AND HOUSE BILL 7777, WHICH PROVIDE FOR THE ERECTION IN WASHINGTON OF A MEMORIAL TO THE SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES OF THE UNITED STATES WHO LOST THEIR LIVE IN THE WORLD WAR

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to the bills S. 938 and H. R. 7777.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, each year we gather on Memorial Day to review the memories and to honor the fallen heroes of four American wars. About the middle of the last century we engaged in a war with Mexico, and 12 years later

marked the beginning of our long and bloody Civil War. In 1898 we were drawn into an armed conflict with Spain, and in 1917 the cry of the endangered representative governments of Europe brought us face to face with the serried ranks of autocracy.

To pay a loving tribute to all of these gallant men who offered their lives in defense of country and of principles vital to liberty, we, in common with millions of our fellow citizens throughout the length and breadth of the land, join on Memorial Day to testify with speech and song, with silent tears and fragrant flowers, our appreciation of what they did.

With senior Senator of New York, Senator COPELAND, I have sponsored a plan to build in your Nation's Capital a memorial which will forever immortalize the glorious heroism of those who made the supreme sacrifice for freedom during the late World War.

Some of them sleep in marble cities of the dead, guarded by a Nation's faithful vigil; some in old fields beside quiet streams; some in Flanders' fields, where the poppies grow red as the blood that was shed upon the hard-fought fields of France; and some lie in unknown graves. Wherever they sleep, a Nation's love is with them, and their memory will ever be cherished.

Mr. Speaker, the heroism of the sacrifices of 1863-65 can never be forgotten, but to most of us who are living today they have not the poignant vividness of personal experience. But the year 1918 brought the significance of Memorial Day and memorial shrines when and where thousands of Americans gather each year. After that memorable year there were few Americans who had not suffered personal loss or bereavement. The real meaning of "dying for one's country" was impressed on the consciousness of the people.

As you are probably aware, World War memorials have been erected in many other countries as a symbol and a tribute to the sterling qualities and patriotism of their soldier dead. They gave their all and we gave our very little. Life was as precious to them as it is to us; nothing that we can give can be more than a weak beginning of their stupendous gift. Nor do they demand great recompense; gratitude and homage, and for those of us who remain in the world of opportunity the message of their young lives, sacrificed to duty, is too plain to be disregarded—they went forth to battle for the cause of human justice and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation sponsored by Senator COPELAND and myself provides for the creation of a World War memorial commission, the members of same to serve without compensation, and the erection in Washington of a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States who lost their lives in the World War. The location and design of such memorial is left to the discretion of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the National Commission of Fine Arts. A sum of \$2,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, is authorized and appropriated.

I can think of no better way to use part of the \$4,000,000 public-works appropriation which Congress has placed at the President's disposal than in the realization of such a memorial.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—
PLUMBING AND SANITARY SYSTEMS IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
BUILDINGS (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval House Joint Resolution 254, entitled "Joint resolution providing for an investigation by the United States Public Health Service of the plumbing and sanitary systems in Federal Government buildings."

The joint resolution authorizes and directs the United States Public Health Service to make a complete survey of all Government properties for the purpose of eliminating alleged defective plumbing and sanitary conditions in Government buildings and report to the Congress on or before

January 3, 1936, the cost involved in making desired eliminations and improvements. The Service is likewise directed to study and report to the Congress on or before January 3, 1937, on the relation of amebic dysentery to plumbing.

The cost of making even a superficial survey of the 2,000 Federal buildings, such as post offices, courthouses, and office buildings, and the thousands of other structures, such as warehouses, depots, hospitals, and establishments of every description, having plumbing and sanitary systems has been estimated to amount to at least \$776,000, and to perform the project with thoroughness would amount to between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000. No provision was made for such a survey in the Public Health Service estimates as submitted in the 1936 Budget, and no appropriation has been made therefor. The Public Health Service reports that as at present organized it would be unable to complete more than 25 percent of the work required in the six cities where it now has sanitary engineer headquarters within the 7 months' period specified in the proposed joint resolution, and then only if all other sanitary engineering activities were dropped during such period.

It is believed that the end sought by Congress can be effectually attained by having the Public Health Service issue the requisite instructions through the various departments and independent establishments to the engineer personnel in charge of Federal buildings throughout the country to survey conditions under their supervision, so that any unhealthful conditions that may be disclosed can be corrected.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 22, 1935.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution to which this message refers was introduced in the House and acted upon by the House a day or two thereafter and before consideration could be given to it by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I therefore move that the message and joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the special orders heretofore made, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the textile situation in New England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PETERSBURG, ALASKA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6085) to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$35,000."

Amend the title so as to read:

"An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$35,000."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC-SCHOOL BUILDING IN VALDEZ, ALASKA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6723) to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$50,000; and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$30,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$30,000; and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works."

The Senate amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a lecture delivered at Harvard University by George Henry Payne, of the Federal Communications Commission, on the subject of the Federal Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would withhold his request for the present so that I may look it over.

Mr. BOYLAN. The lecture is on the Federal Communication Act of 1934 and was delivered at Harvard University by Commissioner Payne.

Mr. SNELL. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this college professor is on the public pay roll?

Mr. BOYLAN. As I explained to my distinguished friend, this lecture is by George Henry Payne, who is one of our Federal Communication Commissioners.

Mr. RICH. If he is a good professor, we will let it go in.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RATIFICATION OF TRADE TREATIES WITH THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of May 15 the Washington Herald carried an item respecting the administration's trade-agreement program which should be of interest to the whole House. It reads as follows:

Secretary of State Hull's pet "unconditional most-favored-nation" program yesterday was tottering, with foreign nations declining to give this country return concessions for tariff favors they are already receiving.

Brazil and Colombia, with whom new treaties are awaiting final formalities, are refusing ratifications because the coffee concessions in which they are most interested already are guaranteed them by Hull's policy.

This development was predicted for months by Hull's critics—notably Trade Adviser George Peek—who protested against the policy of extending all tariff favors granted to any one country to all other countries alike.

Coffee was included in the recent treaty with Haiti, already signed, ratified, and promulgated. Under Mr. Hull's policy of "unconditional most-favored-nation" treatment, the coffee favors to Haiti automatically go to other nations. They must, under all conditions, go to Brazil and Colombia, as these two nations already have most-favored-nation agreements with the United States.

The attitude of both governments is that, inasmuch as they already receive the benefits, there is no reason for them to accord this country any further concessions such as are embodied in the pending new treaties.

Colombia's Legislature recently adjourned without ratifying the new treaty, despite considerable pressure from this country for

action. Brazil's Legislature, after an identical procedure, has reconvened, but to study other matters.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter, and I think that the House is entitled to know more about it. Accordingly, I have prepared a resolution which I shall offer, calling upon the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in his possession touching upon the failure of these countries to ratify the trade agreements negotiated with them.

There is no question whatever as to the facts upon which this press story was based. The trade agreement with Haiti was signed on March 28 of this year, and was ratified by the Haitian National Assembly on April 26. Among the concessions granted to that country by the United States was the "freezing" of coffee on the free list, and under the policy of the administration, as authorized in the Reciprocal Tariff Act, the concessions granted to one country are extended to all countries without requiring them to extend reciprocal concessions.

The agreement with Brazil was signed February 2 of this year, but it was not to become effective until ratified by the Brazilian Congress. Among the concessions proposed to be granted to Brazil was the "freezing" of coffee on the free list. In fact, this was the principal concession granted, and in return Brazil proposed to grant reciprocal concessions on a large number of our products. However, in view of the generalization of the Haitian concessions, Brazil now finds it unnecessary to ratify the treaty in order to obtain the concession which she sought from this country. The same situation exists with respect to Colombia.

Nothing so clearly illustrates the hopelessness of the administration's trade agreements program, so far as any net benefits to this country are concerned, as the situation I have described. The purpose of the program is to expand our foreign trade, but if we are to throw our domestic market open to all countries in order to gain a concession from one, we stand to be the loser by a very wide margin.

Even under our exclusive agreement with Cuba, in which our concessions to that country are not generalized, we have had to buy an additional \$16,000,000 worth of goods over a 6-month period in order to sell that country an additional \$4,000,000 worth.

If the present bargaining program is going to result in frittering away the entire domestic market for a mess of pottage, it is the duty of the House to find out about it. The first step is to adopt my resolution calling upon the Secretary of State for a statement as to the status of the Brazilian and Colombian agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution

Whereas it has been reported in the press that the Republic of Brazil and the Republic of Colombia, with whom the President of the United States has negotiated trade treaties, are refusing ratification of said treaties because the coffee concessions, in which they are most interested, are already guaranteed them by the generalization of the concessions granted to the Republic of Haiti under the trade agreement between the United States and that country: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in his possession—

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, this resolution ought to go to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. This is a very serious matter.

Mr. BLANTON. It ought to go to the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then I will have it read in my own time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will have to get unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the resolution being read in the time of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the reading of the resolution.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then I shall read it myself.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman cannot do that except by unanimous consent.

Mr. KNUTSON. I can certainly read it myself, I submit to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot read the resolution without the consent of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am going to read it as a part of my remarks. It would be an extraordinary ruling—

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman's own writing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot even read his own speech if anyone objects, according to the precedents.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that going to be the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not seek to enforce the rule unless the demand is made. When demand is made, the Chair must enforce the rules of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. The resolution ought to go to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the harm in letting the gentleman read his own resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection to the gentleman reading it, but it ought to go to the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this resolution the handiwork of the gentleman himself?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and he is rather proud of it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota will be permitted to read the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will take up the reading of the resolution where the Clerk left off:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in his possession touching upon the failure of said countries to ratify the trade agreements respectively negotiated with them and the reasons therefor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 215).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 3019, a bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 15 of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, and so forth", approved June 28, 1934. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule because it does not show the changes in the law by the proposed bill. I will read the rule which will be found in the Manual on page 338, 2a:

Whenever a committee reports a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

- (1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and
- (2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof

proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair will state that the point of order raised by the gentleman may be good as to reports by a legislative committee. But this is a special rule from the Committee on Rules which merely makes in order the consideration of a bill. The Chair does not think the point is well taken when made against the report of the Committee on Rules and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. RICH. Very well, I will make the point of order when the bill is taken up.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman is going to do that, why take the time on the rule?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado yield to me to offer an amendment that it may be under consideration?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I will.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. O'CONNOR: On page 1, line 8, after the figures "34", insert the words "and all points of order against the bill or report are hereby waived."

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Bankhead	Dirksen	Kopplemann	Sabath
Beam	Disney	Lamneck	Sauthoff
Binderup	Ellenbogen	Lewis, Md.	Shannon
Brennan	Flannagan	McGroarty	Short
Brewster	Ford, Calif.	McLeod	Somers, N. Y.
Brooks	Frey	McSwain	South
Brown, Mich.	Gambrill	Maverick	Sweeney
Buck	Gasque	Meeks	Taylor, Tenn.
Buckley, N. Y.	Goldsborough	Murdock	Thomas
Bulwinkle	Granfield	Oliver	Treadway
Cannon, Wis.	Griswold	O'Malley	Umstead
Carden	Guyer	Palmisano	Underwood
Clark, Idaho	Haines	Perkins	Utterback
Cochran	Hartley	Pettengill	Wadsworth
Connelly	Healey	Peyser	Walter
Corning	Hennings	Rayburn	White
Culkin	Igoe	Reilly	Withrow
Daly	Johnson, Okla.	Richardson	Wolfenden
Darden	Keller	Robertson	Woodrum
Delaney			

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Three hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are taking up at this time H. R. 3019 under a special rule.

I want to call the attention of the Membership of the House to section 17 of the bill which we are going to consider, which reads as follows:

Sec. 17. The Secretary of the Interior shall have power to select a director of grazing and such assistant directors of grazing as shall be necessary to administer this act.

In selecting graziers for the administration of this act, the Civil Service Commission shall be governed by the practical range experience in public-domain States which such persons have had, and educational requirements shall be determined by test and not by any fixed rule.

I object to this bill because of the fact that we are doing the very thing that the Republican Party platform and

the Democratic Party platform stated they would prohibit at their last national conventions—when they stated they would cut down Government expenses, consolidate offices and departments, and do other things that were for the best interest of the people of this country by trying to make some arrangements for the balancing of the National Budget.

I quote from the Democratic platform of 1932:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

I wish to call the attention of Members of Congress to the fact that at the last session of Congress when we were considering the Taylor grazing bill, whereby 173,000,000 acres of land belonging to the public domain which were unappropriated and unreserved were placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Interior and such lands as were fit were to be allocated to cattlemen and rangers for the purpose of grazing.

During the discussion of the Taylor bill it was admitted by practically every member of the Public Lands Committee that the grazing lands should be under the jurisdiction of one department. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, agreed that that was the proper thing to do. Secretary Wallace in his discussion agreed that the grazing lands of the country should be under one department. Mr. TAYLOR, the author of the bill, was very much in favor of this procedure. Mr. DEROUEN, Chairman of the Public Lands Committee, stated that that was his idea of the way the grazing lands should be administered. He furthermore stated to me personally that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, with the aid of the President of the United States, would accomplish that within a year; that they did not want to subdivide the authority for grazing lands on public domain, whether it be that which was under the Forest Service or any lands that would be taken over by the Department of the Interior.

I respectfully call attention of the Members of the House in the hearings before the Committee on the Public Lands in the House of Representatives, Seventy-third Congress, first session, of H. R. 2835 and Seventy-third Congress, second session, H. R. 6462. Referring to page 21 of the hearings in 1934, Mr. WHITE made to Secretary Wallace, who was before the committee, the following statement:

You have under your Department an organization in nearly all the districts of the forest reserve that have control of grazing and other uses of public lands.

Now, that being true, do you think it advisable to put this work under their supervision instead of setting up a new bureau for it?

Secretary WALLACE. It will be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Ickes. It would not be a separate set-up or a new bureau.

Mr. WHITE. You think it could be administered by the same organization?

Secretary ICKES. Yes; without additional expenditure.

Now, since the Taylor Grazing Act was to be administered by the same organization and without any additional expenditure, as stated by Secretary Ickes, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the fact that the spokesman for the Secretary of the Interior before our committee in discussing the merits of this bill (H. R. 3019) stated that the Department of the Interior expected to set up 10 grazing districts in the United States for the perfection of an organization for the opera-

tion and control of these grazing lands. Secretary Ickes before the Public Lands Committee on March 6 stated that he was setting up in his Department a Bureau of Grazing Control and would have a man in charge in his Department with 20 assistants and that in the field to begin with in the 10 grazing districts they would place 14 men in each district, which would make a total of 140 men in the field.

I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives that once a bureau, always a bureau. The beginning today with a set-up of 161 men to start this organization will mean inside of 5 years 1,000 men. When we called this to the attention of Secretary Ickes in the Public Lands Committee meeting the fact that he was doing today what he said a year ago he would not do and asked him why the organization was being set up under his Department rather than the consolidation of grazing lands in the Department of Agriculture with that in the Department of the Interior he stated it could not be done without additional legislation. I call it "passing the buck." After the meeting had adjourned I asked him if he had any objection to the segregation of the grazing lands of the public domain. He said he was perfectly willing. It was my intent and purpose to offer an amendment to H. R. 3019 asking that the grazing lands in the Department of the Interior and those in the Department of Agriculture be placed under the supervision of one head. The chairman of the committee, Mr. DEROUEN, notified me he would give me that opportunity.

We had been meeting on this bill quite regularly during the past month. I had attended practically every meeting of the committee. A meeting was scheduled at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 19. I reported at that meeting and the secretary to Mr. DEROUEN told me the meeting had been postponed until Thursday, March 21, at 10 a. m.

I want to say to the membership of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, that if we permit the formation of this new organization under the Department of the Interior, as per the set-up proposed by Secretary Ickes—and he deliberately stated he would not form a new organization—that the membership of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, are administering the grazing lands of this country in a very unethical, unbusinesslike manner, building up a new organization which will add to the burden of the taxpayers of this country in future years still greater burdens.

Instead of reducing the number of bureaus, we are increasing them. Why, then, and now, does not the Membership of this House place under the jurisdiction of some organization all the grazing lands that are now being administered by the Department of Agriculture and this new set-up in the Department of the Interior under one department, whether it be the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture? That should not be a question of great moment to Members of Congress, if we want to do the thing that will lighten the burden of the taxpayers of this country. Why permit a new-formed organization that will make conditions more difficult for the stockmen who graze on public lands in the summertime under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service and when they return their stock from the higher ground to the valley in the wintertime must place them under the jurisdiction of other rangers in the Interior Department? It is ridiculous; it is absurd! It will only lead to trouble vexation; and I can in no way support this bill until the members of the Public Lands Committee have backbones where they seem to only display wishbones, because of the fear in their own minds that they might interfere with either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior. To me such an excuse is absurd, and I believe the membership of the House of Representatives should segregate the grazing lands of this country in order that the public lands can be administered in a sound, sensible, businesslike way to the best advantage of those who graze on these lands in the public-land States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5 minutes to call attention to the form of this bill, and I hope these remarks will be considered generally by the committees of the House.

I am a little surprised that the astute Rules Committee permitted a bill, drafted as this bill is drafted, to come onto the floor. Section 1, for instance, provides:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1 of said act is amended by striking out the following.

That is the procedure to amend statutes. That is not the language which the statute should carry. In other words, when you go to compile your law you will find a section providing that you must hunt up some other section and strike out something and insert something and put in some periods, and after you have done that, if you are a good lawyer and a good grammarian and a good reasoner, you may know what the law is. Otherwise you would not even know what the law is.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a very interesting subject, and I ask these questions in good faith. First, how would the gentleman meet that situation?

Mr. MICHENER. The situation is met in some provisions of the bill. Section 3, for instance, reads:

That section 15 of said act is amended to read as follows—

and then you restate the entire section as amended. I will say this frankly—I do not know who drafted this bill—it looks to me like one of these bills coming from a department and drafted by a new man in the department. I do say that no experienced man in the Department of the Interior ever drafted this bill and sent it up to the committee, because they do it differently when they know how.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's remarks. I believe the terrible mess—and that is the only word to use—in which Federal statutes are today is due to the fact that we do not have a real, comprehensive legislative bill-drafting bureau. I do not say that in respect to the employees there now. They are all competent, but there is no State in the Union that has gone into the mechanics of legislative bill drafting that would have such an insufficient organization as has the Congress of the United States. We do not have any organization at all. I think we appropriate a pittance of \$40,000 a year, when States like Wisconsin, which started the legislative bill-drafting bureau, and other States that have followed, have real legislative bill-drafting bureaus. Because Members have claimed that they can draft any bill and that a Congressman should be able to draft legislation, we have never developed in this Congress a real legislative bill-drafting bureau. The States laugh at what we have in the Congress of the United States. Until we can get Congress to really appreciate that no Member of Congress can draft his own legislation, and until we establish a real legislative bill-drafting bureau, we will have legislative statutes that no lawyer in America can determine what the law is. That is the situation today.

Mr. MICHENER. May I suggest to the gentleman right along this line that within the last few months we seem to be in an era of new bureaus and new commissions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has suggested another bureau which, in my judgment, would be a useful bureau and which would not entail a great deal of expense, in which bureau we might consolidate the splendid drafting service in the House today. We have a splendid drafting service today, but it is too limited.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did not suggest a new bureau, but we might as well not have any bureau compared with what we have now, because we do not afford enough facilities and enough help to really draft legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman in that particular. But, coming back to this bill, what does it do? This bill is the story of what the man who drafted it wanted to accomplish; that is all there is to it. It is simply a statement of the way the man wanted to make certain amendments in the existing law. I am making this suggestion during the consideration of the rule, not of the bill; I hope the committee will not ask this House to pass this bill in its present form, for it would be lamentable to present to the country a conglomeration of this kind. Section 1 is of one type. Section 3, outside of the first line or two, is properly drafted. Section 4 is something else. The bill should be redrafted. I think if it were submitted to the present drafting service of the House, it could be returned to us in 20 minutes written in such a way as to be understood by those who have to deal with it and operate under it. As it is the bill in effect says, "Strike so and so out of some other law and insert something else somewhere else in some other law." How are you going to know the effect of the bill by reading this bill? It is perfectly ridiculous; it is not only ridiculous, it is assinine, and I hope the committee will seriously consider redrafting the bill. I am sure that there are lawyers on the committee qualified to prepare a suitable bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman states that the bill is an assinine bill. I will say to the gentleman that the contents of the bill are worse than that.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know just what that would mean.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think the full discussion of this bill will take place after the rule is adopted. We have received no more requests for time under the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs upon the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 34, noes 11.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DE ROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend sections 1, 3, and 15 of "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3019, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After a pause.] One hundred and five Members are present—a quorum.

Mr. DE ROUEN. Mr. Chairman, the three amendments offered to the House in the pending bill are suggestions made by people living in the 11 States where there are grazing lands. Mass meetings were held in many of these States and the bill incorporates the suggestions made at these meetings.

The committee carefully considered the situation from all aspects and there is no doubt whatever that the three amendments are necessary if we are to accomplish the purposes intended to be accomplished by the Taylor grazing bill of 1934.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE ROUEN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the composition of these mass meetings?

Mr. DE ROUEN. The committee has a brief brought to it from the meeting held in Colorado. At this meeting every State interested sent representatives. In the volume in the files of the committee are contained the statements made at that meeting.

Mr. BURDICK. Were those meetings composed only of the interests who wanted to lease the lands, or were they composed of everybody concerned?

Mr. DE ROUEN. Notice of the meetings was published in newspapers and was posted in various places. I assume that the various interests affected were represented at the meetings.

Mr. Chairman, as I am just out of the hospital following an attack of heart trouble, I shall ask my friend, the ranking member of the committee on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], to explain the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The pending bill amends the Taylor Grazing Act in four particulars. It will be remembered that the Taylor Grazing Act passed by the House during the last session of Congress provided that all land in the public domain could be used for the formation of grazing districts. This bill applies only to 11 States. There are some 167,000,000 acres of land designated as public lands. By the terms of the Taylor Grazing Act as passed by the House this entire area was made available for the purpose of the formation of grazing districts, but the bill was amended by the Senate cutting down the area available for this purpose to 80,000,000 acres.

The Department of the Interior sent men into the field for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act as passed by Congress. They went to the various States. They found the States favorable to the formation of grazing districts, and in every State where there was public land public meetings were held. Everyone interested in the question was given notice and the people generally responded to those notices. The result was that after hearings in the various States the Department found that it had demand for 143,000,000 acres of land to be placed in grazing districts. In order, therefore, to carry out the purpose, intentions, and desires of the people in these various States it will be necessary for Congress to amend the Taylor Grazing Act so as to include at least an additional amount of land to that included in the original act.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman tell me how much of the 82,000,000 acres of land is now being used for grazing?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I would say a large part of it is so used; practically all of it in some way or other.

Mr. CULKIN. It is not all being used. It is proposed now to turn over the entire 165,000,000 acres carte blanche to the Secretary of the Interior. This bill gives the Secretary of the Interior complete jurisdiction over this whole area?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true.

Mr. CULKIN. Autocratic jurisdiction?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I would not say autocratic jurisdiction, but it gives him jurisdiction over this area.

Mr. CULKIN. It withdraws this land from settlement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That has already been done.

Mr. CULKIN. It not only withdraws the 80,000,000 acres but the remaining amount.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. All of it is withdrawn from homesteading and from settlement now.

Mr. CULKIN. I understood that the land that was not included, in other words, the difference between 80,000,000

and 165,000,000 acres, was subject to settlement under the order of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; the gentleman is in error. If he will read section 15 of the original act, he will find that all of the public land is turned over to the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of leasing, if he desires to lease the land, but only 80,000,000 acres can be used for forming grazing districts.

Mr. CULKIN. When this bill was passed in the House, it will be remembered that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CARTER] made a very sustained and very able speech against this procedure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It was a very able speech; I agree with the gentleman; but I do not think it was very well sustained by argument.

Mr. CULKIN. It did not result in favorable action by the House, but it seems to me now we are going too far.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not yield for a speech from the gentleman, and I wish he would ask questions.

Mr. CULKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding thus far.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, getting back to where we were, I may say the first amendment we are asking here today is an amendment so that we may have the right in the various Western States to include in grazing districts all the land that the people of those States want included. There are various reasons for this, and I should like to point out some of the reasons. It was found when we went into the States and began to segregate certain areas for grazing purposes that in order to rehabilitate those areas and bring the grass back and put the ground in a condition so that it would be valuable it was necessary to limit the number of cattle or the number of sheep that could be grazed on those areas. The result was, of course, that the areas that were not in the grazing district would immediately be overcrowded, and it was seen at once if that kind of condition obtained all the land that was not within the grazing areas would be completely denuded and rendered absolutely worthless. We could see, therefore, that it was necessary to put all of the land within the grazing districts or, as stated, the land that was not therein would be entirely denuded and rendered valueless.

Mr. Chairman, we had another situation arise. Under the Taylor Grazing Act we have established some 40 or 50 civilian conservation camps. These camps are established on this land and the C. C. C. boys dig wells, make trails, build roads, plant various kinds of grass, and do things generally that will rehabilitate the soil and bring it back to its former condition, where it will be of value. These camps cannot be established on any land that is not within the district, because the Department has ruled—and I think rightly—that they will not go on land, rebuild it, reestablish it, and put it in the condition in which it should be placed unless they have some control over its future; therefore these camps cannot be established on any of these lands not within the grazing districts.

For these two very important reasons it is absolutely necessary that this act be amended, as originally passed by the House, to include all of the land under the public domain. I think this is a most important provision.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Is the gentleman satisfied from his experience on the committee and having listened to the discussion that the bill as now presented to the House is fair to the homesteader and to the large operator equally?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. I may say that we had before our committee both classes. I have received hundreds of letters from my State and various other Members have received many letters from their States. Not only that, but, as I stated a few moments ago, the Department has gone into every State to determine the sentiment of the people and it has been found that the sentiment is almost unanimous for the passage of this bill in the various States.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the people in the gentleman's State who use these lands for grazing in the summertime must have their flocks under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Some do, yes; not all.

Mr. RICH. If this act is passed and in the summertime they graze these flocks under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, when they are brought off the high places, or their winter-grazing grounds, then they must be under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Of course, to a certain extent that is true.

Mr. RICH. Well, that is a fact. They must be placed under the supervision of the Department of the Interior if this bill is passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true. These lands would be under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe—and he is a member of the committee and interested in the grazing situation in the State of Utah—that all of these grazing lands ought to be under the supervision of one department and not under the supervision of two departments of the Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am very glad to answer that question. I may say that as far as I am individually concerned, I would have no objection at all and should be very glad to have these lands under the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, but more especially under the Department of the Interior.

However, no harm can come from the dual operation of these lands. The operation that the Forest Service has is entirely separate and distinct from the operation of the lands under this bill. They are different lands, under different conditions, under different environment, different circumstances, and the dual operation of these lands will in no wise affect the purpose of this act. The matter can be carried out so far as this act is concerned just as well by both departments, as provided in this bill, as could be done by either one of the departments.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will permit an observation at this point, I disagree with the gentleman with respect to that statement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am very sorry to disagree with the gentleman on anything, but we have disagreed before.

Mr. RICH. The same cattle that graze in the wintertime under the Department of Agriculture must be grazed in the summertime under the Department of the Interior, or vice versa, and when our committee tried to get information here in Washington with respect to grazing, we had to take it up with the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Nothing can be dealt with so far as grazing lands are concerned unless we take it up with both departments. Would it not be simpler if there were only one Department rather than two? I do not see how the gentleman can claim that administration would be just as easy when we have two Departments to deal with.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DEROUEN. Will the gentleman explain that this grazing bill is a conservation measure and has as much to do with conservation as anything I can think of in the preservation of these grazing areas for the benefit of the public?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am very pleased to have that suggestion.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the approximate cost of administration under section 17, where it is provided that the Secretary shall have power to select a director and assistant directors? Will the gentleman venture an opinion as to the probable cost?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The bill provides for that, and the House has appropriated for the administration of this act the sum of \$250,000.

Mr. DITTER. Does this bill contemplate any further request for an appropriation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No further request at all.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. However, when the bill is in operation, fees will be collected sufficient to maintain it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am pleased to have that suggestion.

Under the Taylor Act, as the gentleman from Oregon reminds me, of course, we collect fees. For every head of cattle and for every head of sheep grazing on this land fees will be collected. Fifty percent of this goes into the general Treasury, 25 percent goes to the county where the land is located, and 25 percent goes for the upbuilding of rehabilitation of the land itself. So that we expect when this gets under way fairly, instead of being an expense to the Government, it will, in fact, bring revenues to the Government.

So far as I am concerned, this is all I care to say about the first amendment; and if there is any question on the amendment, I will be pleased to entertain it now. If not, I want to go to the second amendment.

The second amendment simply provides for a certain kind of survey. In our Western States the Government has ceded to the various States certain land sections. In our State we have, for instance, school sections 16 and 36. These sections cannot be given to the State until there is a survey made. The State, of course, wants to have these lands so they can trade them for other lands and in order to accomplish this result we have provided that instead of going on to the land and actually surveying it in this rough and mountainous, and sometimes desert, country, we can survey it from field notes or from maps in the office and thereby be able to give the State the amount of land it is entitled to so it can exchange this land for land in other sections.

Mr. PIERCE. Those sections, 16 and 36, are school lands given to the States by reason of their admission.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true.

The next amendment, which is amendment numbered 3, differs from the original bill in perhaps two particulars. Under the original bill the Secretary of the Interior was not permitted to lease any land that was contiguous to a homestead or to a settler unless it included at least 640 acres. He could only lease it to land that was contiguous to the settler. We have found this impracticable because in a number of instances there are smaller tracts than 640 acres and in numerous instances the adjacent owner does not have any cattle or sheep or any use for this land and therefore it cannot be used. This amendment is simply a clarifying amendment to permit the use of this land.

Section 4, which has been attacked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], is simply for the purpose of carrying out the original act. It does not add anything to the original act except to designate how these people are to be chosen.

The original act provided that such amounts and such means as should be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act should be provided by Congress, and that was done. What we have sought to do is to make it definite, and we provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to select the director of grazing and such assistant directors of grazing as shall be necessary to administer the act.

That is no different from any other department of the Government. We think the Secretary of the Interior should choose such director and assistants as he may need to carry out the provisions of the act.

The reason is this. You sometimes have in the western States men who are very familiar with cattle, men who are very familiar with sheep, men who are really expert on the range, men who are expert executives so far as carrying out this range act is concerned. Yet if they had to pass a technical examination under the civil service they would be eliminated, and the result would be that we would have

college professors operating the range. In order to do away with that we have provided that the Secretary shall select the director and his assistants.

The Secretary was of the opinion that he would need five assistants.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think that is a wise provision. I am firmly convinced and believe that men who are practical are better than college professors to administer the provisions of this bill. I want to say to the gentleman that I am in hearty sympathy with that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. If I have done the gentleman an injustice, I want to apologize.

Mr. RICH. The great point I am making is, and what I object to, is the dual control; that is my whole objection to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have not had time to study the bill, but I will ask the gentleman if the purpose of the bill is to liberalize grazing on the public domain?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is the purpose, to a certain extent.

Mr. PIERCE. Not to liberalize, but to regulate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is an effort to liberalize and regulate it.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is my understanding that most of the land on the public domain has been overgrazed, and that is partially due to the dust storms.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true. This bill is to correct that and to rehabilitate the land.

Now, I want to say in reference to this amendment that there was a subcommittee appointed on this particular amendment. We met with the Civil Service Commission and others, and after careful deliberation we agreed on practically every word of this amendment. Here is what we tried to get at:

We felt that it would be unfair to have college men just because they were college men have these positions. We thought that the positions should be filled largely by men who had a wide experience on the range. The Civil Service Commission took the view that unless we put in this amendment that education should be required by test and not by any fixed rule they could say we will require everyone who has a position to be a college graduate or a high-school graduate or have a 2 years' college course, and so forth. Under the amendment they could not put in a rule like that.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Is that not rather a serious reflection on the Democratic Party's present appreciation of college professors?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will leave that to the gentleman. I do not think so. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Is the gentleman sure that in answering these test questions it would not require technical knowledge in order to pass the examination?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No. I think it will not. I think we have liberalized it just as much as we can.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. In all seriousness, will the gentleman justify that change which he spoke of under section 3, by which discretion is vested in the Secretary of the Interior to determine the matter of the leases? I think the gentleman did say something about it earlier.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is already in the original act.

Mr. DITTER. Is the discretion in the original act, that is vested here, with regard to the privilege of the Secretary to determine?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. That is in the original act. This is just a reenacting of that law.

Mr. DITTER. Even as to the matter of preference?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that when the original Taylor grazing bill was being considered at the last session of the Congress I opposed it, and opposed it as vigorously as I could. At that time I took occasion to state the reasons for my opposition. If the original bill were before the Congress again for passage, I should oppose it now just as vigorously as I opposed it then; because I still believe the principle of the original Taylor grazing bill is wrong.

However, the Taylor grazing bill is not before the House at this time for consideration. The Taylor bill is now existing law, in process of administration. What we are considering here now are certain proposed amendments to that law, and the question to be decided is whether those amendments ought to be adopted. It is my opinion that the amendments should be adopted. Improper as I believe the Taylor Grazing Act is, I certainly have no objection to having it improved, if that is possible; and I believe the proposed amendments are calculated to do that.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I gladly yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman stated that he considered the Taylor Grazing Act improper, illegal, and wrong?

Mr. MOTT. I did state that.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman state why?

Mr. MOTT. I stated my reasons at length when the original bill was under debate last session, but I shall be glad to review them briefly for the benefit of my colleague. My objection to it is very fundamental. The Taylor grazing bill takes away from the Congress of the United States all legislative authority over the public domain of the United States and vests that authority in the Secretary of the Interior. It effectively repeals all of the homestead laws which have heretofore been upon the statute books of the United States. In lieu of that legislation so repealed, the act grants to the Secretary of the Interior absolute discretionary authority, including lawmaking jurisdiction, so far as the use of land is concerned, over the entire public domain of the United States. It permits him, in his discretion, to repeal the homestead laws by departmental order or decree whenever he pleases. It permits him to say to one citizen of the United States, "You may take up a homestead here", and at the same time permits him to say to another citizen of the United States, "You may not take up a homestead there." It substitutes government by decree for government by law within the public domain.

There are about 179,000,000 acres of public domain in the United States, all of which, under the law as it existed prior to the enactment of the Taylor grazing bill, belonged to all of the people of the United States, and all of the people had a right to use it in common. The Taylor bill repealed this common right of the people to the use of this land.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that there was practically no homesteading going on; that the lands in the public domain were simply valueless as homesteads?

Mr. MOTT. I do not understand that at all. That is not the testimony before our committee. That matter was very thoroughly gone into in committee, and we have had witnesses from all over the United States. Some of them, I may say, were very emphatic in contradicting that statement. I understand the gentleman's argument on this point perfectly, but I do not agree with him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not know whether I understood the gentleman correctly or not. Of course, the gentleman understands that that privilege he is now talking about has already been taken away under the Taylor Grazing Act, and these amendments have nothing to do with that.

Mr. MOTT. I admit that, certainly. I have been stating my objections, not to the amendments, but to the original Taylor Grazing Act, for the benefit of my colleague from Oregon. All of the land now is withdrawn from public entry by proclamation of the President of the United States, and this was solely on account of the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act. This act is in existence. It is the law of the country. We do not have any more homestead laws in the United States. Nobody can take up a homestead any place in the United States unless he asks permission of the Secretary of the Interior. That is what the Taylor grazing law did. That was the main object and purpose of the Taylor Act, and that was, and is, one of my principal objections to it.

Of course it is claimed, and it may be true—I am not quite satisfied on that point—that this is a conservation act as well. It may be true that it will help to preserve some of the grazing lands. I hope that is true. The fact remains, however, that there is not a word, not a syllable in the entire act which compels any conservation. If any conservation is to be effected upon the public domain of the United States under the Taylor Act it will be entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. I have no doubt, of course, that the Secretary will exercise his discretion in this regard to the best of his ability, because he is a conservationist. The point I am making is that conservation is, at best, an incidental factor in the act and not the fundamental object of it.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that in addition to eliminating those lands from future homesteading it gives the Secretary of the Interior a bloody clutch on the cattle industry? It makes him czar of the cattle industry in a large portion of the United States?

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman's forceful language is, of course, his own, but I doubt if anyone would seriously contend that the Taylor Act places very much of a limit on any of the powers it undertakes to grant to the Secretary. That is one of the purposes of the bill, to place authority in the use of public land in the hands of one man. I am quite aware that regulation of some sort is necessary, and I do not object to purely administrative regulation under definite law. My fundamental objection to the Taylor grazing bill is that through it the Congress gives up its power to legislate in regard to the public domain. My fundamental objection to the act is that it takes the lawmaking power over the use of the public domain of the United States out of the Congress of the United States and vests it in the discretionary authority of an executive department, and that it repeals the homestead laws of the country.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Certainly, I yield to the lady from Arizona.

Mrs. GREENWAY. While there is not in this bill any section authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to rehabilitate the earth's surface, the original act specifically authorizes and directs him to do any necessary work to prevent soil erosion and protect the public domain.

Mr. MOTT. I think that is true. Under the act the Secretary of the Interior can do anything he pleases in that regard, in his own discretion.

Mrs. GREENWAY. I thought the gentleman said it did not really direct him to take care of the public domain.

Mr. MOTT. I do not think the original bill really directs the Secretary of the Interior to do anything. It gives him authority to do it if he wants to. That is my interpretation of the original bill.

Now, so much for the original Taylor bill, which is the law of the land and which its opponents, through lack of

numbers, could not repeal if they wanted to. I have spent too much time on the original bill, which I opposed, and not enough upon the amendments, which I intend to support.

What are these amendments? When the bill passed the House at the last session there was no limitation as to the grazing area over which the Secretary of the Interior should have jurisdiction to make rules, regulations, and restrictions. When the bill reached the Senate an amendment was adopted limiting the grazing area to 80,000,000 acres. The first amendment removes that limitation. It was found upon an attempt to administer the law that it could not be administered equitably with that limitation for the reason that some areas would be included while others would have to be excluded. In the eastern part of the State of Oregon, the district represented by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], there are very large areas used for public grazing. Cattle raising is one of the principal industries of that part of the State. With a limitation of 80,000,000 acres, all of the public grazing land in eastern Oregon could not be included, and that created the impossible and unfair situation of having grazing on one area regulated and restricted but unrestricted on an adjoining area.

A typical example of that was in Crook and Deschutes Counties. On account of the limitation, these counties were left out of the regulated grazing area. Now, in the territory adjoining those counties, where grazing is to be regulated and restricted under rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior, the transient cattle raisers are prohibited from coming in and using that land. Transient cattle raisers cannot use the range in any part of the country where these regulations apply.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Unless all of the grazing land is included, therefore, transient cattle raisers will go into that part of the territory which does not come within the operation of the act and will obviously injure and probably put entirely out of business the resident cattle raisers.

No matter what I think of the original law, therefore, I would certainly be obliged, in order to protect those people, to support these amendments. There are other amendments, I may say also, with which I am heartily in accord because they do tend to make possible the equitable operation of this law which in its original form was impossible; and although I am opposed to the original law, although I would like to see it off the statute books, as long as we have that law I certainly want all of my people treated fairly under it. The adoption of the amendments, therefore, becomes a necessity.

I wish to take occasion now in the remaining minute at my disposal to thank the chairman and members of the Public Lands Committee, of which I am a member, for the eminently fair and courteous and generous treatment they have accorded me and the people of my district in the consideration of the original Taylor Act. The people in western Oregon, whom I represent, did not want that bill. We have a great deal of public land in my part of the State of Oregon. It is not grazing land. It is revested public land; it is a part of the public domain; but there was a very serious question whether that land would not be embraced in the far-sweeping provisions of the original Taylor bill. I wanted that revested land excluded from the bill, and the Public Lands Committee was kind enough to accept my amendment to eliminate it and to exempt my portion of the State from the operation of this bill.

I have told you now why I opposed the original act; I opposed it on principle; and I still believe it wrong in principle. I have told you also why I am supporting these amendments; I am supporting them because without the amendments the bill would be admittedly inequitable and unfair to a large portion of the very people whom the original bill is supposed to benefit. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I suppose my taking advantage of the rule at this time will be regarded somewhat as an imposition upon the patience of the House in that I do not expect to speak upon the bill actually before us but wish to make a few brief observations concerning another measure which, while it does not come from the Committee on Public Lands, of which I happen to be a member, but from the Committee on Agriculture, nevertheless affects not only the livestock industry, both on and off public lands, but also the whole industry of farming. It may not surprise you, Mr. Chairman, to know that I intend to say a few words about the proposed amendments to the triple A, so called.

The gentleman from Oregon, who has just spoken so clearly with respect to the Taylor grazing bill, called our attention to the fact that we are from time to time delegating power to make law to executive officers and administrative officials, a power supposed to reside in the Congress of the United States; and when he made that statement my thought immediately went to this other proposal which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and which has to do with amendments to the present law known as the "Agricultural Adjustment Act." If I read the language of the amendments correctly, the Congress is asked to make another very sweeping delegation of the lawmaking power to an agency or agencies far removed from the control of the Congress.

I have only a few moments; I want merely to strike at the fundamentals of this suggestion, if I may, for there is not time to discuss the details of the business of farming, the oldest of occupations, and one engaged in by millions of the American people. I may be pretty old-fashioned; I have been charged with that crime a good many times; but no man who is engaged in the business of farming will misunderstand me when I say that the most precious thing about it is independence.

There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of farmers in the United States who are content to struggle through hard times and to carry on their business in normal good times at a very, very low return, largely because they enjoy the independence of the life. They are their own masters. Their love of the soil and the cultivation of the soil really springs from that human desire to be free. As I read these proposed amendments that condition is to come to an end.

Mr. Chairman, we examine this bill and we notice that there is provided the establishment of a series of marketing agreements to be negotiated amongst the producers of a certain crop, presumably with the assistance of the Secretary of Agriculture and in cooperation with the processors and dealers engaged in handling such crops; and when the marketing agreement is decided and agreed upon by a number of processors equal to at least 50 percent of the total number in a prescribed area or by a number of producers who together produce more than 50 percent of the crop in the prescribed area, that marketing agreement, as I read this bill, immediately attains the force of law. It becomes for that area and with respect to that crop the law of the land to be backed by the force of the Federal Government, a sweeping delegation of the lawmaking power.

Further than that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized under this bill to impose a licensing system on all dealers and processors of a given crop if in his judgment the refusal of 50 percent of the processors or of the producers to sign on the dotted line obstructs the policy of the act.

Mr. Chairman, thus there is vested an extraordinary power in the hands of one man to make law. These marketing agreements, whether they are voluntary or imposed, may include the regulation of the price of the product. They may regulate the area in which the processors or dealers may operate, buying and selling from or for the farmer. They may regulate the quantity that may be produced in a given area and how it shall be marketed. And those regulations, as I read this bill, immediately assume

the force of law. Any dealer or processor who purchases or sells a product raised upon a farm in violation of the agreement may be prosecuted and fined for each violation or for each day of continued violation. There is not a Member of this House who can at this hour visualize what a marketing agreement will contain. The country may be divided into a number of areas and differing regulations imposed in each area in accordance with the marketing agreement to cover that area. We have no idea what kind of law will govern the production of food in the United States as we pass this bill, and I am wondering if it would interest anybody in these curious times, so fraught with hysteria, to regard the fundamentals involved in this situation. I am not speaking of the constitutional fundamentals, I am not competent to discuss that matter, but some of the things that affect human beings.

It is a Fascist idea that the majority of persons engaged in a business may employ the force of government to compel the minority to do as the majority wishes. Fifty-one percent, according to this philosophy, of the persons engaged in a business, be it farming or anything else, under this Fascist idea, may with the support of the Government or its bureaucracies, enact and effect a law governing the conduct of the business and compel the 49 percent to live a life decreed by the 51 percent. There, in my judgment, is the fundamental thing that should attract and hold our attention as we bring ourselves to a consideration of a bill such as the A. A. A. amendment bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. Have the farm organizations of the gentleman's district expressed themselves on this proposition?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not received communications from any farmers in my district, and I may say that my district is almost entirely farms. I think it fair also to say that most of the farmers in my district know that I am in the same business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to those fundamentals, and forgetting the question of constitutionality, does the gentleman believe the establishment and creation of these trade areas through the issuance of these regulations would tend to destroy, impede, or interfere with the exchange of goods and commodities, both manufactured and raw, as between the States and the people residing in those States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why, of course. Conditions vary tremendously over this immense country. What may be wise for an area on the Pacific coast with respect to the raising of vegetables, for example, might be utterly unwise for a similar area in Florida or western New York. These areas will be contiguous one to the other. In an industrial and economic sense they overlap in hopeless confusion and complication. From the purely administrative standpoint, I do not see how the Secretary of Agriculture can divide this country into appropriate areas and make them all work in harmony.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is a dairy farmer?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The dairy cow and the dairy farmer are selected for a particular operation and experiment in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman explain how he markets his dairy products from his farm, and is he satisfied?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure that would interest the members of the committee. I happen to be in the business,

and my only hope is that the Government will let me alone. That is all I care about. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, to the fundamental, again; I am thinking of the rights of the minority. Is the 49 percent to be subject completely to the domination of the 51 percent? Have we reached that point in our development here in America? If that is true, then for the future scarcely ever can the under dog rise up and fight his way to the top. Legislation of this kind involves a philosophy which, in the end, means that once an under dog always an under dog. What is the under dog in business? It is the poor fellow who starts handicapped. Granted that he has thrift and character and energy, but he starts handicapped. How can he rise and fight the battle of life?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Only by competing with his more favored neighbor. How can he compete? Let us be practical. Only by working harder and underselling in a competitive market. Today, in accordance with the new philosophy, that man is called a chiseler and subjected to contumely—the little man who has his life before him and must get ahead. Yet these bills, which come before us—and there is a similar provision in the Wagner Labor Disputes Act which gives to a majority the absolute control of the method by which the minority in a plant shall earn their living—yet these bills come along and say that the little man who can succeed only by fighting for his rights must subject himself to a law not made by the Congress but by his powerful neighbors backed up by the force of government. [Applause.]

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. GREEVER].

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have had considerable correspondence with the stockmen of my State relative to their views with respect to the inclusion of all of the public domain within the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act. This, as we all know, simply means the end of an institution which has been known in the West as free range.

Generally speaking, there has been a wide difference of opinion among the stockmen of the State of Wyoming relative to the desirability of the act. I have opposed the adoption of the first of the amendments which are now before this Committee mainly for two reasons.

In the first place, I have felt that the grazing districts provided by the Taylor Grazing Act under the law as it now exists should have been set up and should have been given a fair trial before applying the provisions of the act to all of the lands in the public-lands States. In other words, I am more apprehensive of the practical difficulties which will be encountered in the administration of the act than I am of the act itself. I think it would have been wise, before including all of the public grazing lands in the provisions of the Taylor Act, that a fair trial should have been given in the administration of the act by the creation of actual working of the grazing districts.

My second reason for feeling that the first amendment to the act is not wise at this time is due to the fact that it must of necessity, in order to properly operate, create a herd law, something which has never yet been effected within the State of Wyoming, in that the provisions of the act and the regulations of the grazing districts must, in order to be workable, necessarily contain provisions against trespassing in these districts by animals which have no allocation for range use.

I realize, of course, that the Taylor Grazing Act in itself, in case it can be effectively administered, contains many good provisions, in that it will prevent overgrazing and that it will prevent soil erosion that has been caused by overgrazing. I am mindful of the fact that the act, properly administered, will do away in many cases, as the Secretary of the Interior points out, with the trespassing upon privately owned lands and the overgrazing of the public lands by persons who have no commensurability adjacent to the range lands which they occupy. I am also mindful that my fellow Members from practically all of the public-lands States feel that the amend-

ment is advantageous in their particular localities. I do not feel that Wyoming has the same problem with respect to erosion and overgrazing that many of the other States have had.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we would adopt a far better policy if we were to take the act as it now stands and administer it before putting all of the lands under its provisions. However, during the hearings we have been assured by representatives of the Department of the Interior that the grazing districts would be largely self-governing and their establishment would depend upon the wishes of those people who are owners of stock within the areas proposed to be enclosed within the districts. This administrative policy will, of course, remove much objection because it will be subject to majority designation and rule and will give those within the district the right to say to a large extent, first, whether they shall be included, and second, if they are included, under what conditions, rules, and regulations they will operate.

I must confess that these assurances and the further assurances that the provisions of section 15 of the act will be carried out wherever possible, remove a great deal of the apprehension from my mind, but I still believe that it would be prudent, in this great change of policy affecting the largest industry of the West, to proceed carefully and to feel our way as we go, and with that feeling existing so strongly in my mind as it does I feel constrained to say that I reluctantly and possibly somewhat sectionally disagree with the first amendment, yet I also feel constrained to say that had grazing districts been put into operation under the provisions of the original act and had the success of the administration of this act been demonstrated, I would probably not feel inclined to disagree with the provisions of the first amendment to this act.

I am in full agreement with all amendments except the first. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 4 minutes left, and I yield that time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, we have pending before the Public Lands Committee a bill to create a monument to the first homestead or the first tract of land taken up under the homestead law, which land is located in the State of Nebraska.

This policy of giving a homestead to the people who wanted to settle the unappropriated lands of this country was one of the greatest policies for the development of a nation that was ever written into law in any country.

In my boyhood I obtained an old geography used by my grandmother, and the country west of the Mississippi River was indicated in this geography as the Great American Desert, but through the operations of the Homestead Act and the settlement of the unappropriated public lands of this country, we have built up wonderful communities extending throughout the Western States to the Pacific Ocean. The acquirement of this land and the building up of communities, followed by the railroads and the schools, constituted one of the greatest areas in the upbuilding of a country in the world's history.

It is now intended through the operation of the Grazing Act to abrogate this law. We are to do away with the homestead law and close the door of opportunity to the man who wants to make a new start. By legislative enactment we are to finish up America.

We have left in this country 172,000,000 acres of public land. Under the provisions of the act passed in this House at the last session and amended in the Senate, we are taking 80,000,000 acres of this land and putting it under the administration of a department here in Washington. It is now proposed to amend that act and take the last remaining part of the public lands and bring them within the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act, which will entirely abrogate the Homestead Act and put the entire matter of settling on any piece of this land within the discretion of a few representatives of the Secretary of the Interior and permitting them to say whether that land shall be classified for home-

steads or not. In other words, we put it in the control of some one person to say whether this land shall be acquired under the rules and regulations of the homestead law.

For this reason I am opposed to this amendment. I want to give you a little picture. In my State, in a beautiful mountain valley, with broad, sweeping meadows, supplied with mountain streams, we have one of the prettiest places for settlement or for the establishment of communities and homes anywhere in the country. It happens to be, unfortunately, in a national forest, and the forest officers prevent anybody from going in there and homesteading. I had occasion to travel some 30 miles through these mountains and along this beautiful valley on a truck trail built by the Forest Service, and what did we find there? We find here and there a few standard sheep wagons and a few flocks and once in a while a shepherd. This was in a country where we might have had churches and schools and civilization. As it is, the region is dominated entirely by the Forest Service, and anyone who makes application for a homestead is denied this right and told to keep out. Who is enjoying this land? Who is reaping all the benefits? When you trace the ownership of these flocks you find they are owned by such people as Swift & Co.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS].

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman of the House, I might say that we entered into this long-range program of our public-domain planning with a great deal of uneasiness, but in my judgment the diplomatic manner in which the Department of the Interior has acted in the performance of the service has won the confidence of the stockmen of the West where the public lands are located.

It was my pleasure to participate in the organization of one of these grazing districts under the provisions of the Taylor Land Grazing Act. It was a new era in the administration of this country. Instead of the Department of the Interior here in Washington attempting to administer the Taylor Land Grazing Act out there in the far West, Department officials simply delegated the authority to the men who were actually engaged in raising cattle and sheep.

These men came down from the mountains and plains, organized their committees, elected their officers, and were given the power to make rules under which this was to be administered.

As I sat there and watched the organization, it occurred to me such was one of the most democratic performances this administration, or any administration, has given to this country of ours.

I believe that these amendments are necessary. I believe the people of the West will appreciate them, and I call upon all Members of the House to support these amendments, believing that it will be for the best interests of the people of this country. These amendments to the basic Taylor Land Grazing Act clarify its purposes and enlarge its usefulness. They are the usual changes required after a major piece of legislation has been enacted and has been in operation for a period of time sufficient to disclose its weaknesses. These amendments strengthen the Taylor Land Grazing Act and protect the interests of both the Government and the stockmen and sheepmen. They plug loopholes and add or remove restrictions which have proved necessary in the light of administration of this almost year-old law.

Others have described the technical features of these amendments, and since you have been informed on these points I shall confine my remarks to only two major features of this law.

These two are the decentralization of activities and the efficient administration which have proved salient features of this law since its inception approximately 11 months ago.

It was my duty and pleasure during the last session of Congress to take the floor when the bill was under consideration. I had been informed that this particular type of legislation had been before Congress for a period of 30 years,

more or less, but had always been stopped by those who feared bureaucratic control of the public-domain grazing areas. I have never known any type of individual more independent than the average stockman, and no one more willing to battle for his rights; and this legislation appeared to them as an effort to force them into regimentation and under a departmental thumb.

I had faith, however, in the legislation which appeared before me in committee, and although I was confident that it would become understood and appreciated sooner or later by the stockman himself, I did not realize that it would operate so successfully in such a brief period of time.

Probably the most important factor which has brought about the success of this law has been the home-rule feature. Instead of being subject to dictation from a department in Washington in the matter of grazing district boundaries, in the selection of local officials, and in the making of local rules and regulations, the stockmen in the various parts of the country were given complete authority to create their own administrative organizations, elect their own officials, recommend grazing district boundaries, and otherwise operate almost independently of Washington. Only a few general rules and regulations were imposed upon them and these were so thoughtfully framed that it gave the stockmen every opportunity to organize districts and to continue his operations in harmony with local conditions. This system of decentralizing activities and authority, which has been perfected under the Taylor Land Grazing Act, is a happy one and typifies the true spirit of our form of democratic government. To those who have feared bureaucratic control, I point to it with pride as an example of what can be accomplished in decentralization, and the delegation of authority and responsibility to the governed. It has always been my contention that they are governed best who govern themselves.

I might add that while the administration of the Taylor Land Grazing Act in the field has proved more than successful, because of its home-rule features, the administration set-up in Washington should be accorded high words of praise because of its evident desire to cooperate with stockmen in every possible fashion in keeping with the letter of the law. This is appreciated by those of us from the far West who generally have been forced to travel to this side of the country to present our views. Officials of the division of grazing, however, go among the affected ones in the far West, and bring them news of developments, suggestions, and information. I ascribe much of this success in the field and at the headquarters in Washington to the sympathetic understanding of public-domain problems possessed by our Secretary of the Interior, and to the able management of Director of Grazing F. R. Carpenter and the other officials of the Department of the Interior in whose hands has been placed the responsibility of making a success of this new and long-range public-domain rehabilitation program. As a Member of Congress, from one of the largest and most important grazing districts created under this new law, I feel that I would be remiss in the proper sense of appreciation if I did not relate the success of this agenda, and compliment the Secretary of the Interior for his foresight and good judgment in selecting an administrative executive with academic training and real practical experience, and thus bring definite assurance to those most affected that our grazing problems will be solved by a capable and understanding director of grazing.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 1 of said act is amended by striking out the following: "not exceeding in the aggregate an area of 80,000,000 acres of vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved lands."

SEC. 2. That the second sentence of section 3 of said act is amended by striking out the following: "except that no permittee complying with the rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Interior shall be denied the renewal of such permit, if such denial will impair the value of the grazing unit of the permittee, when such unit is pledged as security for any bona fide loan."

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive, and insert:

Sec. 2. Amend section 8 by adding immediately thereafter: "Areas and values of unsurveyed school lands within or without grazing districts may be approximated by protraction or otherwise for the purpose of effecting exchanges of State lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "land", insert "that the second sentence of section 3 of said act is amended by striking out the following: 'except that no permittee complying with the rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Interior shall be denied the renewal of such permit if such denial will impair the value of the grazing unit of the permittee when such unit is pledged as security for any bona fide loan.'"

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, if you will turn to page 2 of the printed bill you will find the text of what was section 2 of that bill stricken out.

I believe that that section should remain in the bill, and for this reason: If it is not left in the bill, and if the amendment I have suggested is not adopted; the result will be that a vested right in many instances will be given to private people in the public domain. The manner in which they will acquire the vested right is this:

Under the language of the original Taylor grazing bill, the text of this proposed section 2 of the pending bill is included. It reads:

That no permittee complying with the rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Interior shall be denied the renewal of such permit, if such denial will impair the value of the grazing unit of the permittee, when such unit is pledged as security for any bona fide loan.

It will be apparent, I think, to everyone, under that language, it would be perfectly possible for a permittee, by keeping his grazing unit continuously mortgaged, to have an absolute vested right in the public domain; a vested right which never could be taken away from him. If we are going to regulate the grazing area so as to give all the people of the United States who want to engage in the business of grazing as equal an opportunity as possible, then we should provide that no one may ever be given a vested right in any part of that public domain. The right to deny a renewal of permit to any permittee should always be retained in the Government. Otherwise you are giving to a private person a special right and a privilege which other private persons do not have.

Now, it was first suggested in the committee that the amendment I have offered be included in this bill when it was reported out of committee. Before it was reported out of committee, however, that suggested amendment was stricken out. I think it is proper and absolutely necessary for the protection of the property of the United States and for the protection of the people of the United States that we have this amendment reinserted in the bill.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it the gentleman's idea that there should be no vested right in that range?

Mr. MOTT. I think there should be no vested right by private persons in any publicly owned property, and that range is still publicly owned property, notwithstanding the Taylor Act.

Mr. PIERCE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the permittee might mortgage that permit?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. I understand it is a rather common practice to pledge them as security for loans. The act provides that if the grazing unit is mortgaged, then the Secretary of the Interior shall not deny the permittee a renewal of the permit if denial of the renewal would impair the value of the grazing unit. That, obviously, would enable the permittee to acquire a vested right and to keep it. Everyone should have equal opportunity to receive these permits, and nobody should be given an absolute right, under any conditions, to have that permit renewed indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Mott] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the committee amendment, it is to strike out all of section 2 as printed in the bill?

Mr. MOTT. That was the original intention of the committee. This was the proposed amendment of the committee. Now, the amendment comes in here stricken out, so that there is no amendment, and the language which appears stricken in the bill is no part of this bill at the present time. Therefore, this language, which is stricken in the pending bill, still remains in the original act. My amendment is to strike out from the original Taylor Act the language that occurs on the second page of the pending bill. It is that language which makes it possible for a permittee to acquire a vested right in a part of the public domain.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, as I understand the gentleman, this language is in the original bill, this language which the bill attempts to strike out?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, it will remain in the bill?

Mr. MOTT. It will, and consequently it will be stricken out of the original act.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this for the purpose of again calling the attention of the committee to the language of this bill. I address my remarks especially to the chairman of the committee. I understand the committee does not want to take the time now to try to correct the bill, and I shall not insist upon that if there is an understanding that when the bill goes to the Senate an effort will be made to have the bill drafted as it should be drafted, so that we may understand just what it is. If the chairman will take that up, very well. Otherwise I think we should have a quorum.

Mr. DEBOUEN. The gentleman understands that we can not vouch that, but we are in perfect agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. If the chairman will ask the Senate to do it, they will do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will say to the gentleman that I will personally look after that and see if it needs amending; and if so, I will try to secure the appropriate changes. I am anxious to have it right.

Mr. MICHENER. Then it will be done. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have had much to do with Government lands, representing a district about 300 miles square, two-thirds of which is either in the public domain or in the forest reserves. I have been very ardently for the Taylor bill from the very beginning. I did everything I could for it a year ago. I think it is one of the real bills that passed last session. I am delighted to know that it is receiving these amendments at this time. It was a great error that it was cut down in acreage by the Senate and we were not able to put it into full operation.

I am opposed to any changes at this time suggested by my colleague from western Oregon [Mr. Mott]. I do believe that a man should have a right, the same as he has in the forest reserves, to a renewal of his permits. I think there is such a thing as a vested right for a man who uses these ranges. The great opposition to the original Taylor Act and

the opposition that has been expressed here comes from those who have water rights on springs and rivers, and for that reason command great sections of the public domain.

The statement has been made that the public domain is homestead land. As a matter of fact, there has been practically no homestead land for 30 years anywhere in the West. Sometime ago we extended the limit that might be taken up by one individual to 640 acres, but even then hardly any was taken up. So that argument is simple buncombe; it does not mean anything.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the gentleman familiar with the records of the General Land Office and the number of homesteads that are now being initiated?

Mr. PIERCE. I am; and I have taken notice of the gentleman's description of that very beautiful mountain valley, but I would like to have the gentleman tell us some more facts about the elevation of that valley. Not even in summer does a period of 30 days go by without a killing frost. Is not this true?

Mr. WHITE. But that does not prevent the raising of hay and the supporting of cattle.

Mr. PIERCE. That is all right, but if the gentleman is going to establish families and civilizations way up on top of that mountain, I do not know why it could not have been homesteaded under regulations of the Forest Service.

Mr. WHITE. When it was withdrawn from the Forest Service it was inaccessible because there were no roads.

Mr. PIERCE. And it is inaccessible now because it is way up on top of the mountain. It is a mere dream.

Before we had regulation the public lands were being grazed so hard that the grass was being killed out. A few people came in with herds of cattle and sheep. Their animals took the grass off, but the people did not own an acre of the land. When this law is in full operation it will double the value of the grazing area on the public domain and instead of this area being an expense to the Government it will be a source of revenue.

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that if he would come out West and look at the public domain he would understand what we are trying to do. If this bill is passed the land will be put in very excellent shape and so maintained. I would have changed some provisions of it had I been drawing the bill; I would have put all the public lands under one head; however, there will be no difficulty in the dual operation of the law governing the forest reserves and the public domain.

Mr. RICH. I am very glad the gentleman admits that he would put the public lands all under the one head, because that is what I am trying to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I merely want these 5 minutes to get the question submitted by the gentleman from Oregon straightened out. As I understand it the Taylor Grazing Act, in its present form, contains this language in section 3 thereof:

Except that no permittee complying with the rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Interior shall be denied the renewal of such permit, if such denial will impair the value of the grazing unit of the permittee, when such unit is pledged as security for any bona fide loan.

Mr. DE ROUEN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, section 2 is stricken out leaving the bill as I have read it just now. Is that true?

Mr. DE ROUEN. That is correct. I may say to the gentleman from Utah that the language to which he refers was not in the bill as it passed the House but is what is known as the "McCarran amendment", and was put in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. But it is a part of the original bill.

Mr. DE ROUEN. It is in the bill at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to my colleagues here today that if there was any reason whatever for the adoption

of the Taylor Grazing Act it was that of regulating the public domain. Is that true?

Mr. DE ROUEN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the effect of leaving this language in the bill? It thwarts that very purpose by allowing the permittee to perpetuate a pledge or a mortgage against his permit, and as long as he does that you preclude the Secretary of the Interior, the head of the grazing department, and all other officials connected with the administration of this act from efficient regulation.

Why? Because leaving the bill as it originally became law, including the objectionable language specified by me, in my opinion, tends to place the permittee in a position where he may willfully and unscrupulously continue and perpetuate a mortgage against his permit and thereby preclude proper and efficient administration and regulation. Such actions, of course, would be rare, and it may be argued that the possibility of such actions is too remote to warrant caution on our part at this time, but it is to protect the people in whose behalf this bill is enacted and the officials who will administer it against these unscrupulous persons that this language should be stricken from the bill. This language would permit collusion on the part of banks and their debtors, who may be permittees, and I am sure that it would be only a short time, were we to let this bill go unremedied, before the officials administering the bill would be calling upon us to protect them from the vice the inclusion of this language permits. If we have confidence in the Secretary of the Interior, and the officials whom he will place in direct charge of the administration of this bill, then we can have no doubt but that they will administer it insofar as it is possible and practicable for the benefit of all persons, associations, and corporations coming within its terms; this includes not only permittees, but their creditors, who may be holding permits under this act as collateral security. We need have no fear that the Secretary of the Interior, or his successors in office, will willfully interfere with such collateral security, except for the general welfare of the people in whose behalf this bill is enacted. While, on the other hand, striking this language from the bill places the administering officials in a position to administer the law without being hampered and coerced by some banker or unscrupulous permittee, who is selfish enough to protect his own interests at the expense of the general public using the grazing lands under this bill.

I urgently request the committee to consider this amendment and accept it as a part of this bill. I do not think we should wait until it goes to the Senate in the hope that body will do what we leave undone. Why not perfect it in this body and be through with it when it goes over there? Why not send it to the Senate in proper form?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE VETO OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES BILL SUSTAINED BY THE SENATE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues of the House, the adjusted-service certificates compensation bill, known as the "Patman bill", was before the Senate today in debate. I have just returned from the Senate, and listened to their debate and heard many able speeches for and against the so-called "bonus bill." I have just been informed that the final vote was 54 to override the veto and 40 to sustain the President, or seven more than necessary to sustain the veto.

WHAT THE PATMAN BILL MEANS TO THE THIRD DISTRICT AND MINNESOTA

Under the Patman bill, the following counties in Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, would receive:

Anoka	\$381,374.65
Chicago	273,144.19

Isanti.....	\$250,197.51
Washington.....	512,634.63
Hennepin.....	10,723,327.35

A total of \$12,140,678.33.

These counties are all in my district.

The State of Minnesota would receive \$53,099,466.63.

When I voted for the bonus bill in the House of Representatives yesterday, I was thinking of the soldiers back home in Minnesota, back home in Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Anoka, Chisago, Isanti, and Washington Counties, and all of our great North Star State. I was thinking of the tens of thousands of these veterans out of work, in the relief lines, hungry, and many of them poverty stricken in the extreme, well on the way to the poorhouse, after their brave and courageous service in the Army of the United States under the American flag in France, fighting "to save the world for democracy", at least so they were told.

VOTING AGAINST ENTERING THE WORLD WAR

I tried to save them from that terrific and awful experience of battle ordeal in France. I voted "no" on America's entry into that war, and to my dying day I will be proud of my vote, and I know I was right. After we were in the war I voted to sustain the Army in the field until victory was ours, and from that day to this I have never ceased to vote for justice to the soldiers of America, the men of the World War who so courageously carried our banners across the ocean.

The first obligation which a nation owes to any of its citizens or any class of its citizenry is to the soldiery of the country—the men who forged the Nation upon the fields of battle; the men who drenched the very soil of the country with their own blood so that their Nation might live. These men who entered upon the field of battle suffered in fever camps and from insanitary conditions thousands of miles from home deserve the best the Nation can give; and I have stated on innumerable occasions that there is wealth in this country; that there are billions in this country for the soldiers if we will only go and get that money and see that the service men get the money that was promised to them.

BIG BUSINESS AGAINST THE VETERANS

The battle today is not a battle in France. It is a struggle in America between big business and the veterans. Big business refuses to pay the bill that is owing to the veterans. They say, "No; we must not print any money and give it to the veterans." And the veterans vainly reply that all they will get will be immediately spent for necessities. It will go into the channels of trade to aid and benefit the country at large. But that does not seem to satisfy the aristocracy of wealth in America. That is not satisfactory to the money kings and the financial powers of these United States.

This hereditary aristocracy of wealth is ruthless and merciless in its attitude toward the soldiers. Now, that the war has been fought and won they are not concerned with the soldiers any more. They are willing to let them drift into poverty, destitution, and even to the doors of the poorhouse. That does not concern the money changers in the temple, for have they not their enormous war profits in their coffers safe and secure? They have their mansions, their millions, their yachts. They have their limousines, and all that goes with wealth and luxury in this world, and they are callous and hard and unyielding, and even contemptuous toward the men in uniform.

I pledge the soldiers of the country, of the Third District, and Minnesota and America that I will fight this aristocracy of wealth, these money changers in the temple, until they are driven out of these precincts of government where they have intruded themselves, and established themselves as the great invisible government in control of all American affairs.

VETERANS FORWARD INTO A NATIONAL LABOR PARTY

There is only one thing that can accomplish this, and that is the establishment of a great national labor party. I call attention to the fact that all Farmer-Laborite Representatives in the House are voting solidly for the service men. There is not a break in our ranks. Our senior Senator from Minnesota—Farmer-Laborite—voted to override the President's veto today. A labor party is the soldiers' party. It is

the farmers' party. It is the party of labor and the working-man of America. It is the party of the rank and file of the people, whom God must love for He made so many of them.

THE FIGHT WILL GO ON FOR THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

The fight will go on for the adjusted-service certificates; and I have only one fault to find with this bill: It is not enough. No one can measure the sacrifice of the soldier for his country. It cannot be measured in money or denominated in gold, or in any of the precious stones of this earth. It is beyond the measure of money and wealth. The adjusted-service-certificates compensation is only an infinitesimal part of that which they earned; but once they are promised, they are entitled to it, and those who say it is not due until 1945 should remember that every other class of citizens has been benefited in this crisis, and that time is not an element now that the crisis is on.

There is no merit in the claim that inflation will destroy the currency. The Chief Executive himself stated in his message that the payment of the bonus would not impair the Treasury, so why argue along that line any longer? And, so far as inflation is concerned, there is no difference between inflation of the currency of the country or inflation of the bonds of the country, except that inflation by bonds is worse than inflation through currency, because inflation with bonds means a terrific load of interest payments in addition to the bonds.

I want the country to know also that there are some of us here who will continue to fight for the payment of the adjusted-service certificates and the Patman method of payment until the fight has been won. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And in the meantime the unemployed soldier has to live on a standard wage of \$19 to \$94 a month?

Mr. LUNDEEN. The gentleman is absolutely right. Think of it! Nineteen dollars per month for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE

These things are well known to all men, and it is time now today to reform our lines; to fill the gaps; to march ahead forward to build a great labor party and send Congressmen and Senators who will vote to stand by the soldiers of America; stand by the men who wore the uniform in time of war. That time is here. There is not a moment to lose. Forward to final victory!

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to all that has been said, and I am very anxious to emphasize one or two reasons why I think these amendments should be passed. Maybe it is appropriate that I speak, because I opposed this bill last year rather vigorously until almost the end. I opposed it for very human reasons. I opposed it because I think we all hate to see more bureaus, more Federal control, and more red tape. However, Mr. Chairman, there is a reason why this bill was considered, and one portion of my State illustrates that perhaps more clearly than almost any other place in the United States.

In Graham County, Ariz., we have had in recent years 19,000 of our fertile acres washed away. Some of the people who homesteaded there in the last generation have a bridge spanning their homesteads today; and that, I think, is the reason this bill is being considered. It is a matter of erosion control.

Mr. Chairman, may I say something about my experience in the committee in dealing with the Interior Department. It has been a wonderful experience to find that the Interior Department met us with an open mind, acceded in, at times, to our wishes, and apparently without prejudice, to some very important suggestions that apply not only to this bill but have to do with the future of the American people. The last five lines of the bill have to do with its administration—the choosing of graziers and are an important instance of what we should be trying to get into every bill of this sort that comes on the floor. They state that in

selecting graziers for the administration of this act that practical range experience in public domain States and educational requirements shall be determined by test and not by fixed rule.

The lines were a serious issue in the committee, and the fact the Interior Department accepted graciously and apparently gratefully our suggestions that the administration of this bill be given to our local people who understood the business and not be administered by college graduates from other States should be applauded. [Applause.] This indicates that we intend to trust our local people. It indicates that the Secretary of the Interior not only believes but is demonstrating his belief in a certain amount of decentralization of Government and authority, and, third and peculiarly important, it concedes that maturity, common sense, and experience have a place parallel to what is known as "higher education." [Applause.]

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I request the members of the Committee to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. The committee has gone over this matter very thoroughly. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] is a member of the committee, and knows that this amendment was added to the original bill by Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada. At this late minute to try to add new language to the amendments reported and agreed to by the committee I feel would disturb the entire bill, and I am therefore asking the Members to stand by the committee and defeat the proposed amendment.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the language which was first proposed in the House Public Lands Committee striking out section 2 on page 2 of the bill was not at the suggestion of the Senate, and not at the suggestion of anybody in the House?

Mr. DEROUEN. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question because I have not been in conference with the Senators. I do not know.

Mr. MOTT. It was not stricken out by our committee.

Mr. DEROUEN. Absolutely; it was.

Mr. MOTT. If it was stricken out by our committee, I do not recall the circumstance of its being stricken out.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the gentleman favorable to the regulation of our public domain by the Interior Department, or does he want to restrict and limit it?

Mr. DEROUEN. Indeed not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is that not exactly what the gentleman is doing by leaving that language in there? The gentleman makes it possible for the great big sheepmen and the great big cattlemen to perpetuate a permit already obtained by merely having the land pledged to some bank. If the gentleman agrees that the Secretary of the Interior should have power to regulate and control our public domain, then why in the name of common sense limit and restrict him by the inclusion of language such as has just been read?

Mr. DEROUEN. The language in the original bill is not the language of the Public Lands Committee of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then why not strike it out right now?

Mr. DEROUEN. Let me explain. This language was put in there by Senator McCARRAN to protect loans that were outstanding and held by the banks. Of course, it could happen, as the gentleman stated, and I agree with him, that some dishonest person could come in there and perpetuate his permit by letting his loan stand.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman believe in that type of legislation?

Mr. DEROUEN. I am sincere in my belief that I do not think that these public-land gentlemen who live over there will do such a thing. Of course, I do not know.

Mr. PIERCE. I really think the amendment ought to be accepted. I did not take that view at first, but after reconsideration I believe that it ought to be accepted.

Mr. DEROUEN. Very well. I will leave it to the Committee to vote, and will withdraw my objection, but I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Mott amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That section 15 of said act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized, in his discretion, where lands of the public domain are so situated as not to justify their inclusion in any grazing district to be established pursuant to this act, to lease any such lands for grazing purposes, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

With the following committee amendment:

After the word "prescribe", in line 19, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That preference shall be given to owners, homesteaders, or other occupants and lessees of contiguous land to the extent necessary to permit proper use of such contiguous land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 23, insert a new section, to be known as "section 4" and to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That said act is amended by the addition of the following section, to be known as 'section 17':

"Sec. 17. The Secretary of the Interior shall have power to select a director of grazing and such assistant directors of grazing as shall be necessary to administer this act.

"In selecting graziers for the administration of this act, the Civil Service Commission shall be governed by the practical range experience in public-domain States which such persons have had, and educational requirements shall be determined by test and not by any fixed rule."

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but I have offered this pro forma amendment simply for the purpose of allaying any apprehension in the minds of any Members that by the provisions of this bill any desirable or any fit agricultural lands may be taken out of circulation.

I am quite familiar with the lands in these Rocky Mountain States that are principally involved in this legislation. I have been looking at this land and traveling over it and living on it for the last 50 years. I doubt if there is a quarter section of unappropriated public land in the State of Colorado that is worth the filing fee for farming purposes. I doubt if there is a section of it on which a man can make a living farming, and there is a whole lot of it on which it would hustle a jack rabbit to make a living. The good farming land, and much that was not good, was taken up long ago.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman might say that is true of the entire 11 States, including this mountain valley of our friend from Idaho.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I quite agree with my colleague from Oregon, that this is practically true of all the remaining public domain.

For the past 10 or 12 years when veterans have come to my office to consult me about veterans' preference laws for filing on lands I have never hesitated to discourage them. I have never hesitated to tell them that if the Government made them a present of a section of this land they could not make a living on it.

So, instead of being deprived of any valuable rights, it would really be a crime to allow people to settle and undertake to make a living by farming on this land. The tragedy of a lot of that country, when you drive through it and see the little deserted shacks where some poor devils have gone with their wives and grubbed away the best years

of their life, is that they have been allowed to take up millions of acres of this land, now abandoned, in the first place. Millions of acres should never have had a plow stuck in it.

The Government is now engaged in the activity of repurchasing and taking much of this land out of circulation and trying to rehabilitate it or at least to restore it to a state of nature. A lot of it, if it is fit for anything, is fit only for grazing and it would not hurt a lot of it if it could even get a rest on grazing, and this can only be cared for by Federal regulation.

I want to say to you that in my opinion the overgrazing of this type of land has been a far greater injury, has resulted in vastly more erosion than timber cutting in the Rocky Mountain States, because most of the timber is up in the gulches and on the mountain slopes where there is little or no farming anyhow. This land has been grazed over and trampled over until the skin of earth has been destroyed, with the consequent results of erosion, and the erosion I have seen on it in my lifetime is something horrible. I am 100 percent for this erosion service. If we do not take it up and stick to it and do something about it, there will be reproduced in this country the pictures you have seen in the Geographic Magazine, taken in Asia and China, where whole sections of country have been destroyed forever. I have seen in my time in the West an arroyo 30 feet wide, widened to 600 or 700 feet. In my home town we have a stream called the Fountain River. It is said to be one of the most unruly streams in the world. It is now about 1,000 feet wide in a sand stretch. An old pioneer told me that he recalled the time in the sixties when he could jump his horse across the channel of this stream and in grass up to the saddle girth. The widening of this stream or the washing of these terrible arroyos all through the mountain West is due almost solely to the denudation of overgrazing. There never was any timber on this land, so cutting timber did not destroy it. What did destroy it was the overgrazing of this country. The cattle and sheep ate the grass down to the roots and they ate the roots out of the ground and they trampled over it until they broke the surface of the soil and there was nothing to hold the water when it came and then erosion did the rest.

If there is any chance to conserve that country and bring it back or restore it to a state of nature, it will have to come through such legislation as this and water conservation. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the speeches that have been made on this bill today I am reminded of the famous poem of John G. Saxe of the six blind men who went to see an elephant. When we are talking about 172,000,000 acres of the remaining unappropriated public land we are talking about quite a tract of land. I am wondering when I hear these trite old sayings about soil erosion and its prevention just what the grazing administration is going to do to protect these widening arroyos.

Reared in Mississippi, I come from one of the States in the Union which has a great amount of erosion. I can show you wagon roads there going over hills where there has never been a shovel of earth turned, and now there are cuts 30 feet deep eroded by dust and rain. I have seen red hills eroded for 40 or 50 miles. I do not hear anything about restoring grass down in Mississippi on eroded land. Out in the West there is some beautiful farming country along these pretty rivers, where the settler has a nice home and is sending his children to school, wintering his stock on 40 or 50 acres of irrigated alfalfa, and turning his steers and his dry cattle back into the hills to graze in summer. He brings his cattle back in the fall, culls out his steers, sends them to market, and gets a few dollars to support himself and his family. Such are the men we want to protect. These are the men from whom the big sheep and cattle owners and some of the big banking interests of the western cities want to take this land. When this is done the settlers and ranchmen will have to keep their cattle on their little 40 acres. What do we care

for some banker in Salt Lake City, or other banking center, who has an alimony suit with his wife over the dollars he has gleaned from these valleys by taking the range away from these farm owners? It is like the reservations. I have seen Indians come galloping down to a farmer and tell him his cattle were over on the reservation and had been impounded; he can come down there and get his cattle by paying the damages or they will sell the cattle. When this law goes into effect we will have a herd law. If a man's cattle stray off of his own premises on to these public lands, they will be impounded, and he will have to pay the damages to permittees or go out of business. This law is going to put a lot of people out of their homes.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Forest Service has put people out of business?

Mr. WHITE. It has. There is a case in my State where one outfit is ranging 80,000 head of sheep on public land, and we have a man up in a beautiful valley, about which I have been telling you, with 1,800 acres on which he is paying taxes, and he cannot get range for one head of sheep. The forest people say, "Why, he can range his sheep on his own land; forest range is not needed." The big outside sheepmen have come in and taken the range away from a bona fide settler who is paying taxes on 1,800 acres of land, and I cannot make a dent in the Forest Service. When this law is put into operation, when you put these people in the West out of business on the plea of soil erosion, who is going to raise the funds for soil protection?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions.

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. I want to know how Andy Little gets a range for 80,000 sheep in Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. Because he has a stand-in with the Forest Service. That is how he gets it. We cannot break that control. We are trying it now. The Forest Service permits for 10 years all expired last year and now they are going to renew them and perpetuate the same thing.

Mr. PIERCE. There are only three permits allowed to any one man by the Forest Service. How does he get by with ten?

Mr. WHITE. Oh, there are many ways of getting around the law by dummy permittees, relatives, and in other ways. These laws are evaded plenty.

Mr. PIERCE. Has the gentleman presented those facts to the Forestry Service?

Mr. WHITE. Yes. I would ask the gentleman from Oregon if he is not running a couple of bands of sheep right now on the forest reserves?

Mr. PIERCE. Indeed, we are—that is, my son and I—and we are getting along very nicely with the officials of the Forest Service.

Mr. WHITE. We can easily understand why the gentleman is so favorable to special privileges to special interests.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. It is true that there was no more bitter opponent than I of the Forestry Service when it came into our State, but it saved the forests of Oregon. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. What are we saving them for? The gentleman will admit to me that this Congress is going into its pocket every session to appropriate money to save the forests for the big lumber interests when they are ready for them.

Mr. PIERCE. I deny that. I do not believe that is true. They are saving them for the people. The selective logging plan adopted by the Forest Service will be of inestimable value to future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has again expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 3, beginning in line 1, strike out all of section 17 and insert "The administration of all grazing on the public domain be placed under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I was very much interested in the remarks of my colleague from Arizona [Mrs. GREENWAY] when she gave credit to the Department of the Interior for inserting the last paragraph in this bill. I think my colleague from Arizona is somewhat timid in trying to claim credit that is due to her and the members of the Committee from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], Wyoming [Mr. GREEVER], Idaho [Mr. WHITE], Arizona [Mrs. GREENWAY], and Oregon [Mr. MOTT], because of the fact that they realized that college professors were not qualified in their judgment to administer the Grazing Act in the Western States.

They realized that men with experience, men who have endured the hardships of the West, men who know something about grazing lands, raising cattle, were better qualified than college professors, who probably do not know what a cow, a steer, or a sheep is other than it is an animal with four legs and a tail.

I want to give the credit to the western members of our committee for having inserted in the bill this provision and not the Secretary of the Interior or his assistants, for if it had not been for those members of this committee the provision would not have been inserted in the bill of using men of practical experience to administer the act. It is because of their knowledge of grazing land, their ability to administer affairs in the western part of this country in reference to grazing that the Secretary of Agriculture was compelled to adopt this part of the bill, or they would not have reported it out of the committee and the Interior Department knew this and acquiesced to their demands.

Now, the point I want to bring out here is this: That every one of the members of this committee, all intelligent people, for whom I have great respect, sometimes become a little bit department timid; they seem afraid of Government departments, and the reason we do certain things is because we are very timid and are afraid to assert ourselves. You can see the results in this particular case when we stand up for our rights.

If the members of this Committee have backbone and try to do that which is for the best interest of the grazing States in this Nation, and I wish all members of the Committee would do the thing they think is right in every respect, buck the Department of the Interior and the Agriculture Department, and include in the bill the things that they know to be the right thing to do, and that is to consolidate the grazing authority of this country and place all grazing lands in one department. It is the proper thing for Congress to do.

I realize that my amendment can be ruled out on a point of order, and I thank the members of the Committee for giving me the permission to make this my last request to this bill to consolidate grazing authority. I see my genial colleague from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] standing in his place, and I think he should be included—he wants to do the right thing, but he is timid about it—saying anything to the departments. He says it should be done and ought to be done. [Laughter.]

If our committee would say to the Departments that they want to have the grazing administered in a sound and sensible way, we would add the amendment that I have proposed and let the Department of Agriculture administer this Grazing Act. Or, if the majority prefer, place all grazing in the Interior Department. If they would do that, we would be doing the job in fine shape; and I do hope and I do wish that the membership of the House would assume their responsibility and adopt the provisions of this amendment,

which will be for the best interests of the Western States and for the best interests of the grazing industry, and the best thing for the taxpayers of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this minute so that I could take a bow on behalf of the western Members for the compliment paid us during the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Such encomiums falling from the lips of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are so rare that I do not think they should be passed unnoticed. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I will use the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in making the observation I did about my western colleagues on the committee I felt I was right. Whenever I think the western Members, or any other Members, or even the President of the United States is right I will be for them. [Applause.]

The President's message yesterday on the bonus bill was one of the finest pieces of literature and arguments that ever has been expounded from this rostrum [applause], and I want to say that I was for him 100 percent yesterday. Whenever these same individuals are wrong, then I am against them. I figure right is right, and wrong is nobody.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has spoiled the whole thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. That is because yesterday you did not support the President, and I am glad to say that I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado press his point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well taken and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend sections 1, 3, and 15 of "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3896) to provide for the immediate

payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, for controlled expansion of the currency, and to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with his objections, and passed by the House, on a reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WALSH and Mr. BORAH members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

THE N. R. A. AND THE A. A. A.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a brief letter written by me to the editors of certain papers in the State of Utah relative to the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter relative to N. R. A. and A. A. A.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1935.

Mr. E. R. RASMUSON,
Editor the Provo Herald, Provo, Utah.

DEAR MR. RASMUSON: I have read and carefully studied your letter of May 1, urging me to oppose continuance of the N. R. A. and the A. A. A. I agree with your letter to the extent that I believe in the principles of Americanism as those principles were proclaimed and defended by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln; that I am opposed to any kind of undemocratic dictatorship, and especially any dictatorship that embodies Fascist measures or methods; and that I will defend American liberties with all my energy. However, it occurs to me that you have been grossly misinformed.

In the second paragraph of your letter you say, in part, "Before the passage of the N. R. A. bill business had started to recover and unemployment was decreasing. The N. R. A. did not help; it hindered progress." I am afraid, Mr. Rasmuson, that you have been reading the statements of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, rather than the official figures, or even the reliable data published by reputable newspapers. I believe that no one who is familiar with the actual facts can honestly say that N. R. A. has hindered recovery. The truth is that before the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed business was on the verge of collapse, and unemployment threatened us with the worst crisis in our history. That you may know, here are the figures:

The National Industrial Recovery Act was approved June 16, 1933. The following table shows index numbers, based on the averages for the years 1923-25, for industrial production, factory employment, factory pay rolls, freight-car loadings, and commodity prices:

Month and year	Production	Factory employment	Factory pay rolls	Freight-car loadings	Commodity prices
March 1933.....	59	59	37	50	60
June 1933.....	91	67	47	62	65
February 1935.....	89	82	69	65	80

The first fact that attracts your attention in this table is that under the new deal factory production has been increased from 59 percent of normal to approximately 90 percent of normal; certainly that speaks well for the effectiveness of the Roosevelt administration. Next, and more important, is the fact that, whereas in March 1933, only about 59 percent of the laborers of America were employed, immediately after the enactment of the N. I. R. A. the figure rose to 67 percent, and that in February of this year, after almost 2 years of N. R. A., 82 percent of the laborers of our country were gainfully employed. Certainly that constitutes a miracle of reemployment. Again you will perhaps remember that from the autumn of 1929 until the spring of 1933 wages were constantly decreased, and fewer and fewer workers were drawing wages; perhaps you will even remember that during the Hoover depression we constantly assured ourselves that conditions were as bad as they could possibly get, and that therefore "prosperity was just around the corner." And we did finally hit bottom just before Mr. Roosevelt became President. In March 1933 factory pay rolls; that is, the wages received by factory employees, fell to 37. Immediately after the enactment of N. I. R. A. the index number for factory pay rolls rose to 47, and in February of this year it

stood at 69. These and the other figures shown in the table speak eloquently for themselves and for the continuance of N. R. A.

This whole process of eliminating unemployment, putting more people back to work, increasing wages, increasing business, abolishing child labor and sweatshops, is what Mr. Roosevelt meant by the new deal. The keystone of the new deal, so far as industry is concerned, is the N. R. A. To oppose those governmental principles which have aided so much in eliminating unemployment, putting more people back to work, increasing wages, increasing business, abolishing child labor and sweatshops, and so forth, is to oppose the welfare of the American people, to work for the continuance of wage slavery, to precipitate industrial peonage, to foster exploitation, to boost for the Hoover depression. Mr. Fletcher calls the new deal "fascism." But then, Mr. Fletcher is paid to utter dangerous nonsense, paid by those who profited from child labor, sweatshops, and wage slavery.

It is also luminously clear, Mr. Rasmuson, that you have been grossly misinformed concerning the achievements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Of course, the farmers and the country at large have suffered from the drought. But Mr. Roosevelt did not cause the drought, in spite of all the innuendoes issued by Mr. Fletcher. If you will consult the farm bureaus in your county, or the individual farmers (hundreds of whom have written me concerning this matter), you will find that they almost unanimously favor continuance of the A. A. A. The reason why the farmers support continuance of the A. A. A. is that the A. A. A. has halted the decline in the prices of farm products, and has instituted measures which are very rapidly boosting farm prices back to levels that make it possible for farmers to live according to American standards. That you may know, here are some figures:

The Agricultural Adjustment Act was approved May 12, 1933. The following table shows a few wholesale prices for farm products:

Month and year	Corn, per bushel	Wheat, per bushel	Steers, per 100 pounds	Hogs, per 100 pounds	Wool, per pound	Cotton, per pound
March 1933.....	\$0.25	\$0.49	\$5.44	\$3.92	\$0.20	\$0.07
June 1933.....	.43	.79	6.36	4.58	.33	.10
June 1934.....	.59	.92	8.60	4.34	.33	.12
March 1935.....	.80	.97	12.33	9.29	.25	.12

You say that you are opposed to continuance of the A. A. A. Well, Mr. Rasmuson, I leave to you the hopeless task of arguing with the facts and with the farmers. Meantime, I will vigorously support continuance of the A. A. A., because experience has proved that it is beneficial to American farmers, that it is the first successful effort the American people have made to protect the rights and promote the welfare of that class which has been most ruthlessly exploited by the money magnates in spite of the fact that it produces what we eat and what we wear.

I distinctly remember that Mr. Roosevelt promised to fight for a more equitable distribution of the national wealth. I also remember that he told us he was bound to lose that fight unless the people of the Nation, including the newspapers, cooperated with him. Mr. Roosevelt has commenced to bring about a fairer and more equitable distribution of national wealth. He has not completed the job, because he is fighting against the dishonesty, corruption, and inefficiency of long years of money rule. But he has fought and will continue to fight for redistribution of wealth and economic justice. The people of the Nation have, up to date, cooperated with him. I urge you, if you advocate a fair distribution of wealth, to fulfill your duty by cooperating with the President who was elected by the people and with the administration which is carrying on in spite of the propaganda of Morgan and his kind.

No administration in American history has so well fulfilled its promises as has the Roosevelt administration. No government in the world has so heroically set about the task of promoting the general welfare. The achievements of the Roosevelt administration up to date justify the confidence and faith of the American people. They also justify the support of those institutions who are charged with the duty of keeping the public correctly informed on current affairs.

Trusting that I have made my position clear, I am

Very truly yours,

ABE MURDOCK.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6114) to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "proceedings;" down to and including "Zone", in line 4, and insert "and in the District Court of the Canal Zone in the cases and modes prescribed in sections 61 and 62, title 7, Canal Zone Code (48 Stat. 1122)."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the amendment merely changes the reference to the appropriate provisions of the Canal Zone Code. As originally drawn—and I will say that the bill was drawn in the Attorney General's office—the enactment of the Canal Zone Code of 1933 was overlooked and instead of making reference to the code reference was made to the original laws. The amendment changes the references to refer to the provisions of the Canal Zone Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill the purpose of which is to pay the veterans in cash at this time the present value of their adjusted-service certificates. The bill provides that such payment be made from the \$4,880,000,000 which the President has already been authorized to spend for such purposes as he may desire. This method of payment will not create a new debt, but, on the contrary, it will discharge an existing obligation.

The President plans to spend \$4,880,000,000 of the taxpayers' money within the next 14 months, which means that spending must go on at the rate of \$350,000,000 every 30 days. The program for disbursing this vast sum has developed now to the point where it is apparent that much of the money will be used for projects of doubtful value and some of it will be squandered for purposes of political expediency, such as the Passamaquoddy project to harness the tides.

Payment of the veterans in the manner provided for in the bill which I have introduced will accomplish at least two good purposes: In the first place, it will settle the bonus question on a basis which is eminently fair both to the veterans and to the Government and take the issue out of politics. In the second place, as I have stated, it will permit a substantial portion of the \$4,880,000,000 to be spent in the cancelation of an existing indebtedness, which will not only bring financial assistance to thousands of veterans and their families but will prevent such funds from being diverted to otherwise questionable purposes.

The taxpayers know that the President has been authorized to spend the colossal sum of nearly \$5,000,000,000 within the next 14 months. As long as this money is going to be spent, anyway, I believe that the taxpayers would prefer to have a portion of it used to pay the veterans what the Government owes them rather than have this vast sum squandered for other purposes.

I wish further to emphasize that this method of payment does not require printing-press money; it does not necessitate the imposition of any new taxes; it does not increase the national debt beyond the expenditures to which the Government is already committed.

SUMMARY OF REED BILL FOR CASH PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES—GENERAL PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to permit veterans of the World War, at their option, to surrender their adjusted-service certificates and receive in cash, out of funds to be allocated from the \$4,880,000,000 Emergency Relief Act, an amount equal to their basic adjusted-service credit, with compound interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from November 11, 1918, less any loans and unpaid interest.

According to estimates made by the Veterans' Administration, the amount of all adjusted-service credits, with interest at 4 percent from November 11, 1918, to July 1, 1935, would be \$2,659,686,958. The amount of the adjusted-service certificate trust fund as of July 1, 1935, is estimated at \$1,460,000,000. Therefore, the additional amount required to carry out the purposes of the bill would be approximately \$1,200,000,000.

ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill amends section 507 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act by making the adjusted-service certificate fund available for payments on account of certificates surrendered in order to obtain the benefits of this act.

Section 2 adds two new sections to title V of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, permitting veterans to surrender their certificates and in lieu thereof receive the amount of their adjusted-service credit, with interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, compounded annually from November 11, 1918, to the date of filing their application for cash payment, but not beyond January 1, 1945, less any indebtedness against the certificate.

No payment is to be made until the certificate is in the possession of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and all obligations against such certificate discharged.

If a certificate is held by a bank, a method is provided whereby a loan thereon may be paid and the certificate redeemed from the bank by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The veteran may receive the benefits of this section by application filed during the lifetime of the veteran with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs either by the veteran or his representative. If the veteran dies after the application has been filed, the settlement authorized under the provisions of this section shall be made to the estate of the veteran.

Upon receipt of a certificate from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing the amount due, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay the veteran by a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States.

In acquiring title to notes held on account of the United States Government life-insurance fund, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make payment therefor by the issuance of bonds. All bonds issued for this purpose are to be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act.

If at the date of maturity of the certificate the certificate has not been surrendered, and if at the time of filing application for payment under section 501 the amount of the adjusted-service credit and interest at 4 percent per annum, compounded annually from November 11, 1918, to the date of payment, or to January 1, 1945, whichever is the earlier date, exceeds the face value of the certificate, then such amount, in lieu of the face value, less the amount of any indebtedness required to be deducted under the act, shall be paid immediately by check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States.

Section 3 extends the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act from January 2, 1935, to January 2, 1937.

Section 4 authorizes and directs the President to allocate funds appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 for the purpose of making any payments under this act for which funds are not available from the adjusted-service certificate fund. [Applause.]

DEFENSE OF SOUTHERN LABOR AGAINST UNWARRANTED ASPERSIONS

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein short excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a short newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

On the afternoon of April 23, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], while discussing on the floor of the House the textile situation in the United States, saw fit to cast some unnecessary and highly baseless aspersions against the people who are engaged in the textile industry in the South, which statements are untrue and without foundation of fact. Under the circumstances I felt it my duty to the people whom I represent to ask the gentleman to be more specific in his charges and name the parties guilty of his alleged charges and subjected to his abuse. In insisting that Mr. CONNERY be more specific in this matter, I had nothing

in mind but getting as much information as possible on this particular subject, feeling that his indictment of virtually all the good people engaged in the great textile industry in that section should not go unchallenged.

In my efforts to get this information from Mr. CONNERY I apparently incurred the wrath of the weekly newspaper Labor, published here in Washington by the Association Recognized Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, which paper appears to have been just as maliciously misinformed as Mr. CONNERY himself with respect to conditions in the South. In the issue that followed the exchange of remarks between Mr. CONNERY and myself, instead of printing the facts as they actually occurred on the floor of the House, as could have easily been done, this paper preferred to distort and color a story which they displayed in front-page prominence, charging in the headline: "Exploitation of children is defended by South Carolina solon", followed by the charge that I had defended the textile "bosses" and that I favored the exploitation of child labor in southern cotton mills.

PAPER'S CHARGES FALSE

Nothing was said on the floor in defense of what this paper terms the textile "bosses." Neither did I then or have I ever advocated the exploitation of child labor. I arose on the floor of the House to defend the decent, respectable people engaged in the textile industry in the South against the charges that the food they have on their tables would be thrown in the trash can in New England; that they did not have clean sheets on their beds; that people in the South were forced to work and live in highly inhuman and insanitary conditions; and that they did not receive improvements and the comforts of life until organized labor came South and organized them and secured these benefits for them.

I registered my protest with the manager of this paper against these misrepresentations and distortions. And subsequently I prepared a statement which included the actual remarks as taken from the Record and submitted this to him with the request that it be published in order to give his readers the benefit of the whole truth. The manager of this paper refused to publish this statement.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION

In order that my colleagues, constituents back home, and the public in general may have the whole truth in this matter and may know to what extent this paper went in coloring and distorting their report of this incident, I am including herewith the statement which I submitted to the manager of this paper and which he declined to publish:

Mr. EDITOR: In your issue of April 30, 1935, you published in front-page prominence what purported to be a report of an incident that took place on the floor of the House on April 23 between the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY, and myself. Since you, for reasons best known to yourself, did not give the full text of the affair, as could have reasonably been done (preferring to color and distort it to suit your own purpose), I am asking that you please allow me space in your publication to give a more amplifying account of the matter, which will include, among other things, the full text of the happening, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, in order that your readers might pass in judgment without the complexion given it by your biased press:

"Mr. CARY, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

"Mr. CONNERY, Mr. Chairman, I listened today with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN]. There was merit in some of the things that he said, but, in general, I do not think his speech covered the situation insofar as the textile conditions exist today.

"In the first place, the gentleman from North Carolina, in referring to the Republican administration, did not give the reason but said that these mills in New England moved South during a Republican administration, which is true, but the main reason that these mills did go South, as I brought out once before here today, was because at that time you could work 60 or 70 hours a week in the textile mills of the South, and the wage was as low as \$6 or \$7 a week. These employers in the textile industry went South to get away from decent living conditions and from decent wages for labor in the New England States. The manufacturers who stayed in New England are the ones for whom we are fighting today. They are the ones who believe in a decent wage for labor. They are the ones who do not believe in working little children in their mills as was done in the South at that time, before the N. R. A. They are the ones who believed at that time in a 48-hour law, such as we had in Massachusetts. They are the ones who believed, in other words, in a break for labor and in decent living conditions and decent wages in industry.

"Mr. BOILEAU, Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?"

"Mr. CONNERY, I yield.

"Mr. BOILEAU, Is the gentleman of the opinion that the N. R. A. has helped to rehabilitate the textile industry of the North?"

"Mr. CONNERY, Oh, yes. I will say to my friend that he knows my opinion of the N. R. A. I have always said that the N. R. A. gave the textile industry of New England the first break it ever got from the hands of the Government. We had a 48-hour law, while the South worked 60 or 70 hours a week, and when you put the South on a 40-hour law and put Massachusetts and New England on a 40-hour law in the textile industry, even with a wage differential in favor of the South, you gave them the first break they ever got in decent, fair competition.

"Mr. BOILEAU, I agree with the gentleman that the N. R. A. has helped out the industrial sections, and does not the gentleman believe that, in order to keep agriculture on a parity with industry, it is necessary to carry out an agricultural policy, with the processing tax, and so forth, to offset the harm done to agriculture and to give agriculture a chance to live also?"

"Mr. CONNERY, I am going to touch on that in just a moment.

"Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?"

"Mr. CONNERY, I yield.

"Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, When the costs of industry were increased through the N. R. A., was not that one reason why it was essential to have more tariff protection in order that we might have a chance to sell our goods?"

"Mr. CONNERY, Of course, I have always believed in that and have a bill now before the Ways and Means Committee which I think would take care of this whole situation; in fact, I wrote that into the 30-hour-week law 3 years ago. I saw this whole thing coming at that time, and the labor men came to me and said, 'If you put the country on a 40-hour week, while Japan and Germany and Czechoslovakia and England are working 50 or 60 hours a week at low wages, how can our manufacturers in the United States survive?' I wrote this provision in the bill, and I have it in the bill now before the Ways and Means Committee:

"Wherever the landed costs of any article or commodity—not just the textile, but any article or commodity, including agricultural products—coming into the United States are less than the cost of production of a similar article or commodity in the United States, such article or commodity shall be barred from the country."

"This will take care of your Japanese situation and everything else.

"Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, If the gentleman will permit, I asked the question because I appreciate the splendid work the gentleman has done in the past in protecting industry, and I knew what his past opinion had been upon the question, and I wanted to know if he is still of the same opinion, namely, in view of our increased costs and in view of the keen competition that exists today, does he not think it is absolutely necessary that we have a greater amount of protection than we now enjoy?"

"Mr. CONNERY, Yes; I know it, because my people are walking the streets today in Lawrence, Lynn, and Peabody. They are men who have been engaged in the leather, shoe, and textile industries.

"In reference to the statement of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], I want to touch on that point. I know I do not have to convince him, because he knows that the first meeting ever held by the Committee on Labor where the farmers and labor joined together was held while I have been Chairman of the Committee on Labor. I do not want the farmers to be broke, because if a farmer is broke, he cannot buy the textile, he cannot buy the shoes, he cannot buy the leather, he cannot buy the electrical products and the thousands of things that are made in our industrial New England. I want him to get a decent break for his farm products, but what I would like to call to the attention of the men who represent the farm sections in this body is that the State Department is saying to the Members of Congress and saying to the country, 'If you cut down on your demand that we buy only American products and go into reciprocal trade treaties, we will fix it a little later so that we can bring in your Argentine wheat and bring in your other products from South America and along the Atlantic seaboard, and we will sell them to you far cheaper than you can buy them from the American farmer.'

"I want your farmers to know about this and to look into the proposition.

"Mr. BOILEAU, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?"

"Mr. CONNERY, I yield.

"Mr. BOILEAU, I want to commend my friend from Massachusetts on his broad viewpoint. I believe he is as anxious to protect the farmers as I am, but I may say to the gentleman that I do not believe we should try to help out industry by taking from agriculture what small benefits they have been able to get during the past few years. We should help industry in the way suggested by the gentleman through a higher tariff, and I am willing to go along with the gentleman on that.

"Mr. CONNERY, I voted for the A. A. A., I signed the petition for the consideration of the Lemke bill, and I voted for that proposition and would be pleased to do so again.

"Mr. BOILEAU, I know the gentleman has always been very fair in respect of all these matters.

"Mr. CONNERY, I do not believe you can have prosperity in the United States unless there is prosperity for the farmer and prosperity for the industrial worker, and I do not say that the processing tax is the sole reason or that it is the bête noir of the textile industry. That may not be it at all. I am informed by the evidence given to us by the textile men and by the labor unions and the workers in the textile mills that the processing tax is working greatly to our disadvantage in the mills, but I say that

the President has appointed this Cabinet committee to look into this matter thoroughly. They are going to start hearings Thursday, and we are going to bring down our millmen and our laboring men and everyone else concerned from New England, and we expect the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the men from the Southern States to bring up their men and put the whole story before this committee; and then, I say, if the processing tax is doing all this harm, get some other way to help the farmer rather than by a processing tax. If it is not the thing that is doing the harm, all right; but we feel that that is the danger.

"We feel that the Japanese importations are a menace to our textile industry. It does not do the Wisconsin farmer any good if the man on Pine Hill next to me, working for the General Electric Co., cannot buy any of the farmer's products.

"Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

"Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman should not use Wisconsin for an example, because we get no benefit from the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

"Mr. CONNERY. It does no good to have a man who lives in Lawrence or Lynn to go broke. All I ask is for a committee appointed by the President to look into this matter impartially, not to look into it as a New England question but as a question for the United States of America.

"When I vote on the floor I do not expect to vote especially for New England. I resented today the statement that a lot of New England manufacturers had come down here to boost or push up the price, trying to blackmail the administration.

"There was a meeting downstairs in the luncheon room. They did not advocate price boosting. They predicated their demand on the fact that people are walking the streets of Lawrence and Lynn. I know what it is. I have seen it myself, and I do not like it. I do not like to see children go hungry.

"Mr. BOILEAU. May I suggest that in the consideration of this proposition that the processing tax is an injury to the textile industry, we should consider also that the N. R. A. is doing an injury to agriculture.

"[Here the gavel fell.]

"Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

"Mr. CONNERY. I imagine you are not getting the whole picture. The gentleman speaks of the N. R. A.—no more child labor, no more "yellow dog" contracts, the right of labor to organize—and if it did nothing more than that it would be worth while.

I do not like the members of the N. R. A. in the textile industry, in the manufacture of automobiles, to write codes for labor. I said it is like a little lamb sitting down by a wolf and the wolf writing the contract between the lambs and the wolves.

"Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. CONNERY. In just a moment. My committee reported out a bill for equal labor representation on the Code Authorities. I am for the N. R. A. I would like to see these difficulties done away with. I would like to see the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill and the 30-hour-a-week bill passed.

"Mr. BOILEAU. If I had my way, I would be very glad to substitute the 30-hour-a-week bill for the N. R. A.

"Mr. CONNERY. The N. R. A. came as a result of the Black-Connery 30-hour-a-week bill.

"Mr. BOILEAU. I was for the N. R. A., and I believe I have the distinction of being the only N. R. A. general on the floor.

"Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

"Mr. MARCANTONIO. On the question of writing the N. R. A., originally Congress wrote it, but since then Mr. Richberg has rewritten it.

"Mr. CONNERY. That is true. That decision in reference to the automobile case in Detroit caused all of the strikes and troubles in reference to 7 (a), and you will never have industrial peace in the United States until you pass the Wagner-Connery bill on labor disputes.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Would the gentleman be kind enough to be more specific in his accusations of industries of the South and name those that worked their employees 70 hours a week prior to the installation of the N. R. A.?

"Mr. CONNERY. I could not tell the gentleman the names of the concerns. I mentioned them several times years ago—mills in the South that ran 60 and 70 hours, and that had child labor.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Would the gentleman be more specific and name those that have enslaved child labor?

"Mr. CONNERY. I could not give the gentleman the names.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. The gentleman ought to be more charitable.

"Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman wants the names, I shall get them for him and take the floor in a few days and give him the names, the dates, and everything else.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Will the gentleman be more specific and name those that forced their employees to live in inhuman and insanitary conditions?

"Mr. CONNERY. I will give the gentleman all of that information later. I have had men come in to me who went through the mills in the South. This was 4 or 5 years ago. They said that what those workers got on their table you would throw into your garbage can in New England. He said, 'You would not have it on your table.'

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Perhaps that was some eccentric investigator.

"Mr. CONNERY. Oh no; it was not. He had no bias in any way whatever; he said, 'I was down through the mills of the South and saw these company homes they had them in and it shocked me; I never dreamed such conditions existed.'

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Permit me to tell the gentleman that I went to work in a cotton mill before I was 9 years old, and I worked there for 21 years, and my people now live at a cotton mill, and I do not give a tinker's dam who told the gentleman that; his information is incorrect.

"Mr. CONNERY. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman, but we have all of that. We have had investigations, and social workers, and everybody else going through the mills of the South. What wage did the gentleman get when he started?

"The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

"Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

"Mr. CONNERY. What wages did the gentleman get when he went to work?

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I got from 5 cents a day when I started until around some twenty-odd dollars a week when I quit.

"Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman got 5 cents a day when he started?

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I was learning, and they were charitable to give me that.

"Mr. CONNERY. Why, nobody would ever pay so little as 5 cents a day to anyone in New England, a child or anybody else.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. But that was a different day.

"Mr. CONNERY. I mean in those days.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I started 36 years ago. The trouble about the labor situation is that New England is trying to dictate to the rest of the country what labor conditions shall prevail throughout the whole country.

"Mr. CONNERY. That is right. New England says, 'We want decent living wages, we will not have slavery, we want people to have a place to live in and a place to sleep in that is decent; we want them to have clean sheets and refrigerators, all of the comforts that every laboring man should have in the United States, and not be ground down.' [Applause.]

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I have not seen anything out of New England that indicates that they have any more comforts among the laboring class there than they have in the South. We have those things. They have electric lights, in most instances, running water, and everything else that they can have.

"Mr. CONNERY. But you have had them only since labor went down there and started to organize. Only since then have you had those things.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. They have had it for a quarter of a century.

"Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

"Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman from Massachusetts would refer the gentleman from South Carolina to the testimony of Mr. Gorman, president of the Textile Union, when he testified on the Connery equal-representation-for-labor bill before our Committee on Labor, he would be convinced.

"Mr. CONNERY. Yes; the gentleman should look that over.

"Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I would not believe it after I had read it."

CHARGES WITHOUT FOUNDATION

As will appear from the reading of the foregoing, the whole matter arose out of the discussion of the textile situation, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], gave the impression, inadvertently or otherwise, that all the textile employers of the South worked the employees before the N. R. A. 60 to 70 hours per week, forced them to live in insanitary and indecent conditions, and exploited child labor. With no pretense of knowing of all the conditions prevailing through the whole South, but knowing full well that such conditions did not exist generally in some parts of the South, I asked the gentleman to be more specific and name the mills in the South which operated 70 hours per week, forced their employees to live in indecent and insanitary conditions and exploited child labor, prior to the N. R. A., in the hope that the gentleman might draw some demarcation between the guilty and the innocent. That does not seem to be an unreasonable request, and neither does it bespeak any unsavory purposes, for surely there is some element of justice left to allow such segregation.

CHARGES SHOULD BE MADE SPECIFIC

Mr. CONNERY agreed to give the specific instances asked for, which means that he will name the mill, the house, and the occupant where such occurrences have taken place, thus affording an opportunity for all parties in interest to pass in judgment. But, now that you have so adroitly come into the picture with your distorted report of this occurrence, I shall gladly relieve Mr. CONNERY and in turn ask you to provide the name of the mill or mills, the house or houses in which people are forced to live in indecent and insanitary conditions, and also the children who have been exploited to their harm, injury, and damage, in violation of the laws of the respective States.

Understand, please, that nothing short of specific instances will suffice, for your ability as a distortionist has been too well demonstrated to permit the public to pass their judgment on any basis other than specific facts. I have no financial interest in any textile establishment of any sort, neither do I have any assurance that as

much as one mill president in my district voted for me for Congress, and certainly none contributed to my campaign. However that may be, I never have on any occasion, and do not now, offer any brief for them, other than to wish for them a most successful and lawful operation of their business, for upon their success depends the operation of the mills and the resultant employment of labor.

Of course, there is no thought on my part of claiming absolute perfection for the working and living conditions of people who work in the cotton mills in the South, neither do I admit as much for the New England States. I grant that there are improvements that can be made to the working and living conditions that would mean a great deal to the people. I have constantly been interested in such improvements and the people whom I represent know that I have been interested in this phase of their lives and well-being. There have been many improvements in the South in the last quarter of a century and they were in evidence long before the strange and unnatural love and compassion of the "wise men of the East" were aroused by the southward movement of New England's industries.

BASELESS AND UNNECESSARY INSINUATIONS

As I stated before, there is no justification for your insinuations that I arose in Congress to defend the textile "bosses." Instead of seeking to express the views of the management, I did arise in the House of Representatives for the purpose of refuting the aspersions cast upon the textile industry of the South and the hundreds of thousands of men and women employed therein. I arose to defend this major industry and those who compose it—textile owners, spinners, weavers, sweepers, or cleaners, all of whom I represent with a deep conviction of adherence to truth and impartiality—because the gentleman from Massachusetts gave utterance to such broad statements as to challenge every thinking man and woman who is interested in the cotton mills of the South.

CAN SPEAK FOR THESE PEOPLE

I feel that I am well prepared to speak for those who work in the cotton mills. My friends and my relatives are there; numbered among the industrious citizenship of South Carolina thus engaged, are the friends and relatives of many of the people of my State. Nowhere in the Union will one find a higher percentage of white, native-born American citizens engaged in any industry than are numbered among the textile workers of South Carolina. They are good citizens, law-abiding people, thrifty people, men and women tremendously interested in the religious as well as the commercial aspects of life.

Among these dependable citizens of our State are to be found the same sturdy characteristics of the men and women who, in 1876, were with Wade Hampton when he overthrew the misrule of reconstruction days and drove the carpetbaggers and scalawags from the borders of the Palmetto State. These people have a glorious heritage of which they may well be proud. They believe in the true principles of Americanism so dear to the heart of every good citizen, and they put the Bible and the flag above everything else. That they are religious, the fine community churches attest; that they are patriotic is shown by the wonderful records made by their sons in the World War. No finer soldiers followed the flag to France than those boys from the cotton mills who joined with their kinsmen from the farms of South Carolina in a common cause for the safety of democracy.

I am stating these facts to give you some idea of the background of the textile people of my State. Communism has never showed its ugly head there. They believe in the supremacy of God, in the sovereignty of States, and individual liberty; and any proposition contrary to these principles will neither be welcomed nor tolerated among my people.

These conditions I know, of my own knowledge, prevail in my immediate section, and from the information and observation at hand, I believe them to be true in a general way throughout the South. There are exceptions, for exceptions can be established to almost any condition, but we should measure the industry by the averages, and not attempt to misjudge it by a pitifully small minority of circumstances.

INDECENT LIVING CONDITIONS CHARGED

The suggestion that textile workers in the South live indecently and in insanitary surroundings is highly erroneous. The twisted and distorted reports which suggest that these people eat food unfit for human consumption, and which should be thrown in the garbage can, is an outright falsehood that apparently is circulated for the obvious purpose of damaging the South as a whole and to bolster up a case in exaggerations and misrepresentations. If those who pretend they are so interested in the welfare of these people would make an honest effort to obtain the facts, they can learn the truth about conditions among textile operatives in our section. Some of the exaggerations are akin to the misapprehension prevailing in some quarters of the North and East that the afternoon diversion of true southerners is tarring and feathering, or perhaps lynching, of Negroes who live in our section. Many misguided but fanatical souls seem unable to ascertain the truth about either.

INDEPENDENT THINKERS

There is another thing impressive about the attitude of the textile workers who live in my section of the South. They are independent thinkers. They do not take orders well from a so-called "leadership" that is pretending to be interested in their welfare in order to collect "so much a month" from them for the dictatorial privileges. A vast majority of the textile workers in our section of the country appreciate the fact that the State of South Carolina, many years ago, abolished child labor and

made it unlawful for children under 14 years of age to work in the mills. That has come about since my childhood days, for I started to work much younger than this and I am glad to state that it did not impair my health or wound my determination to obtain an honest living for myself; in fact, experience and training I obtained as a small boy, in one of the textile plants of the South, proved of great value to me in after years. It was there that I learned to value and appreciate the consistency of diligent application to every job that comes to hand. Another boy who worked in the same room with me and learned those same lessons today is Governor of South Carolina. Neither of us, as boys who worked in the cotton mill, was abused or in any way discouraged from our objectives in obtaining an education and making all advancement possible.

STATE ABOLISHED CHILD LABOR MANY YEARS AGO

As I have just stated, the State of South Carolina abolished child labor in the cotton mills long before the advent of the N. R. A. The State found the textile industry, as a whole, interested and cooperative in providing the maximum sanitation the plants could afford. This is not all; the mill owners have evidenced a sustained interest in schools and churches for the people employed in this industry.

The textile workers of my section do not fall in line readily and willingly, as so many sheep, to follow the orders handed down from alien fields. They are competent and trained workers; they like to work. Agitation and strife do not appeal to them. They have the ability to think for themselves, and the man or woman who says that these people did not have decent food on their tables, or clean sheets on their beds, or comforts and conveniences of life until eastern influences made them possible, is either grossly misinformed or has little regard for accuracy. These thrifty people of my State are not dependent upon the alleged intellect of these so-called "leaders in the East" for their initiative and enterprise necessary to procure food fit for human consumption. They have good food and comfortable living conditions, good schools, automobiles, radios, and recreation programs comparable with the people engaged in any industry elsewhere in this Nation. All these things they attained long before there was any evidence of selfish and unnatural affection for their welfare on the part of eastern agitators.

CAN ADJUST DIFFERENCES WITHOUT OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE

One of the most pronounced characteristics of the southern textile operators and operatives has been their willingness to adjust their differences through a spirit of friendly cooperation. When left alone to work out their problems, a fair and equitable program usually develops. I am firmly convinced that the major portion of labor disturbances in our section have been the outright product of meddlesome agitators, often men who knew or cared little about textile labor but chiefly concerned in furthering their own financial gain. The agitators have brought only trouble to our section—a section where men who have grown up in the industry together, to call each other by their first names, who were probably in school together and played on the same baseball team, are able to sit down and discuss and adjust honest differences of opinion—and none of the improvements of our industry there can be attributed to their efforts.

THESE ARE FACTS

I am asking you to publish these facts, because they are facts. It is only natural that my interest and sympathy should center around the men and women who work in the textile plants of my district in South Carolina. I was reared among them, and I cherish their friendship. From early youth until mature manhood I worked in the mill, and today my relatives are employed there. I do not speak as a casual observer. My observations are not based on distorted reports and glaring misrepresentations. I am familiar with working conditions and living conditions in scores of textile communities, and I know their problems, for I am one of them.

As a representative of all of the people of my district, and in defense of its major industry and the people employed therein, I cannot sit idly by without refuting the aspersions cast upon us by the gentleman from Massachusetts. His remarks insult the intelligence of my textile constituents and our people as a whole. When he says they did not live decently, or have for their tables anything but such sorry food that the high-toned New Englanders would have thrown it into their garbage cans, or no clean sheets for their beds or modern conveniences for their homes, "only since labor went down there and started to organize", he departs from the truth. I will treat it as charitably as possible and assume that he makes these statements through ignorance of the facts.

INVITE PERSONAL INVESTIGATION

If the gentleman from Massachusetts would make a personal investigation of textile conditions in the South, I am confident that he would withdraw the statements quoted above, for no man who knows the facts, and is imbued with a sense of fairness and honesty, would allow such gross misrepresentations to stand. I am likewise confident that if you, Mr. Editor, would glean some sound information from unbiased sources you would cease being a party to such rank injustice as you allowed your publication to deal me in connection with my defense of the textile industry in the South. I am naturally interested in the further improvement of these conditions. We have made good progress. I am confident that future years will bring further developments in social security and improved working conditions, as well as living conditions, that will bless generations as yet unborn. I will seek, in my small way, to contribute to these achievements and to all

worth-while objectives of the textile industry as a whole and every man and woman numbered among its employees. By this course of conduct will I have the satisfaction that comes of the fair and impartial treatment of all of the people. It is only through truth and honesty that lasting strides are made in any industry or any government.

Respectfully requested.

JNO. C. TAYLOR.

ARTICLE UNFAIR AND UNETHICAL

For a period of time after reading the article which so completely misrepresented the remarks I made on the floor of the House, I was at a loss to understand just how any man could be so unfair and unethical as to give the report which this paper carried. My friends and constituents know that I have always been fair to labor. The people who work in the cotton mills in South Carolina and who do other jobs that require labor know that I have their interests at heart. They also know that I do not intend to sit idly by while another man, who comes from an entirely different section and who is naturally less familiar with conditions in my own section, casts insults upon them.

HAVE BEEN AND AM NOW FRIEND OF LABOR

When I first became a Member of Congress and legislation that eventually resulted in the passage of the N. R. A. was being discussed, I went to General Johnson and to the President, carrying the cause of the people who work in the cotton mills in the South, the East, and other parts of this country, asking the President and General Johnson to include in the N. R. A. such regulations as would specifically eliminate the so-called "stretch-out" system in cotton mills and regulate the machine load any one man or woman would be required to perform in any one day. It was evident then that unless an effort was made to regulate the machine load the action of the N. R. A. in setting wage scales and hours of labor would be partially dissipated and full and effective results from the N. R. A. as applied to cotton mills would not be obtained. Without any desire to be egotistical, I can truthfully claim that I was one of the first, if not actually the first, to call to the attention of this administration this particular practice. A "stretch-out" investigation of wide-spread scope was conducted, and later the President formed the Textile Work Assignment Board, which was created to hear complaints arising from such practices. Even abuses that have resulted from the "stretch-out" practice, which, I understand, have been modified since 1933, do not warrant the abuse heaped on these people by Mr. CONNERY.

INTERESTED IN WELFARE OF THESE PEOPLE

These people who work in the mills in South Carolina know that I am interested in seeing them get the best possible wages for their work. They know also that I have been interested in their problems of health with respect to both living and working conditions. With this in mind it is difficult for me to understand how any paper that purports to represent the laboring man could so carelessly and maliciously handle the truth.

DENUNCIATION ANALYZED

At last, however, I have been able to learn where the trouble lies with respect to this false report and I feel that it is my duty to my colleagues here and to my friends and constituents back home to lay these facts before them. Here are the facts:

In the RECORD of April 23, 1935, page 6245, I had asked Mr. CONNERY to be more specific in his blanket charge against the people engaged in the textile industry in the South. At this juncture, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCAN-
TONIO], who perhaps knows less about conditions in the South than Mr. CONNERY does, advised, after gaining the floor:

If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] would refer the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] to the testimony of Mr. Gorman, president of the textile union, when he testified on the Connery equal-representation-for-labor bill before our Committee on Labor, he would be convinced.

To this I was constrained to reply very frankly and said:
I would not believe it after I had read it.

This, I am firmly convinced, brought about the severe denunciation I received at the hands of this railroad paper, so aggravating its editor until he lost all sense of fairness and allowed this entirely unfair misrepresentation to appear in print.

FACTS ABOUT MR. GORMAN

The facts I have with reference to Mr. Francis J. Gorman, who is the first vice president of the United Textile Workers of America are quite clear and to the point. I quote herewith a letter which was written by Miss Carrie Nash, a textile worker and a union member of Greenwood, S. C., to the editor of the Greenwood Index-Journal. This letter was published in that paper and since has been given wide-spread publicity in the South. This letter explains fully without the necessity of any additional comment why I would not believe a statement made by Mr. Gorman after I had read it:

MISS NASH'S LETTER

To the INDEX-JOURNAL:

Please allow me space in your paper to relate my experience in the union.

When the union was first organized I was under the impression that such an organization had the financial backing of the U. T. W. A., in close cooperation with the A. F. of L., which I understood had a large treasury.

At the time the union was organized I was making a good living wage, and was aware of it, but at the same time I felt that if by joining the union, and helping to support the organization, it would at some future time be the means of increasing my own or other people's salaries, I was willing to do so.

After joining I was elected to fill the office of financial secretary. Therefore, I feel that I am in a position to know a few things that might be enlightening to others.

Before the strike was called I had sent to James Starr, secretary to Francis J. Gorman, approximately \$1,100.

During the strike we received weekly bulletins from headquarters issued by Gorman telling us to hold fast, stick together, etc.; that they were behind us and wide-awake, which led us to believe that when we reached a crisis we would receive help from headquarters.

After our local treasury was depleted our secretary was authorized by the president to send Mr. Gorman a special-delivery letter stating our circumstances. This being done, we waited a week, and receiving no reply, a telegram was then sent to Mr. Gorman telling him it would be impossible to carry on any longer without help. We received no reply from this.

At the convention in Gaffney a resolution was drawn up and telegraphed to Mr. Gorman asking for a commissary to be set up in Greenwood for the relief of the two locals here, and to my knowledge Gorman hasn't been heard from yet.

When Peele, Brookshire, and Rogers come down and cry "Stick together, you've got the backing"—well, that's a huge joke. They want the locals to stick together—sure—for that's where their salaries come from.

The only help we ever got was from other locals, and if one local in Carolina has to help another, why is it necessary to send Gorman the money?

Each month that I mailed Gorman's secretary a money order, usually around \$150, there wasn't a minute lost in the time it took for it to get there and a receipt to get back here thanking us and wishing us all kinds of success and hoping we would continue to grow. Of course that was natural, for as long as we continued to grow it meant more dollars in his pockets.

Before the union was organized I don't know of a single needy family in our community, and now I could name a dozen needy families.

What has the union profited any of us? It has bred enmity among a few and brought hardships to many. And now Mr. Gorman doesn't even recall that there was ever a Local No. 2171 in Greenwood, S. C., or if he does, there's no evidence of the fact.

I sincerely hope that if anyone reading this happens to be a 100 percent union member or is still inclined to belong to a union, that he or she will not be offended, for I have merely stated the true facts.

I do not care for any more union experience, and prefer to be dictated to from now on by someone I know personally and not by Gorman.

Thank you.

(Miss) CARRIE NASH.

NOT FIGHTING LABOR

I am not making any fight against Mr. Gorman, the United Textile Workers of America, or any other labor organization as the article in this paper attempts to intimate. My position with reference to all union labor is simple. I believe that any man who desires to become a member of a labor union has the right to do so, and likewise any man who does not desire to be a member is also within his right in staying out. Neither the union or the nonunion man has a right to coerce, tantalize, or threaten

the other, and in making either choice he should be allowed to base that choice on whatever appeals to his better judgment and reason. This principle is fair, democratic, and in accordance with the principles of right as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Any other principle is unfair, undemocratic, and un-American. I fought this whole thing out in my campaign for reelection to Congress in 1934 before the people of the Third District of South Carolina, and despite sinister and ulterior influences that tried to undermine this fair and impartial attitude toward the laboring man as well as other constituents, I was reelected by a satisfactory majority. The people of the district I represent are fair, honest, hard-working people. They are not going to oppress, threaten, or coerce any organized minority or allow any organized minority to bully, threaten, or coerce them.

MR. O'CONNOR'S REMARKS

Perhaps conditions in the home State of Mr. CONNERY, of Massachusetts, are perfect. If they are not, I certainly do not intend to malign or indict the good people of New England as he has indicted and abused the fine southern textile people. I have too much respect for these people and the great work in which they are engaged to set myself up as a critic of the conditions they are facing.

However, since the remarks of April 23 in the House here, a Member of Congress from Mr. CONNERY's section, a man who worked in the cotton mills of New England in the early years, when he was paid "the munificent sum of \$1.50 a week", has arisen in this House and told us something about conditions there as well as in the South. The remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] are highly pertinent to this question at issue. With the permission of the gentleman from New York, I desire to include his remarks again in the RECORD, taken from page 7510 under date of May 15, 1935:

This campaign, which has gained momentum through their chambers of commerce and other parochial and selfish individuals, has raised a dastardly sectional issue between the North and South. I have listened as patiently as I could to the aspersions cast on the textile industry in our Southern States. There are the charges made that labor was underpaid, that child labor was employed, and that the living conditions of the worker were deplorable. It is not necessary for me to reiterate a denial of those charges. Everybody familiar with the situation knows they are not true. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], in a magnificent address, recently disposed of this selfish sectional attack on the processing tax, but he omitted to mention what I can state of my own knowledge. The textile industry of New England should be the last to talk about wages or the living conditions of workers in that industry. I spent 23 years of my life in a Massachusetts mill town. I worked as a bobbin boy in a cotton mill, and, like the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], I received the munificent sum of \$1.50 a week, and this at a time when spinners and weavers, men and women, were getting only \$6 a week.

I have seen company houses, row on row. I have seen company stores; I have handled the company pay tokens. I have seen whole rows of workers living in those company houses thrown in the street with all of their belongings because of some labor dispute. It does not lie in the mouths of the mill operators of New England or the steel operators of Pennsylvania or the mine operators of Pennsylvania, the chief beneficiaries of a high protective tariff, supported for 50 years by a high protective tariff, to make such charges about conditions in the South. Nor could such a complaint come with good grace from the gentleman from New York, who spoke yesterday. It is not over 20 years ago that, under Democratic leadership in the Legislature of New York, the canners were forced to abolish in that country the same conditions that are now charged to the South, and which do not exist. In your canneries in upstate New York you were employing children and you were employing women in childbirth for 20 hours a day and paying them starvation wages.

It was due to the leadership of a great Democrat that this condition was abolished not so long ago. This great Democrat was Alfred E. Smith. [Applause.]

I often think of those mill towns in Massachusetts and New England, which I knew so well, Taunton, Fall River, and New Bedford, represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; Lowell, the home city of the beloved lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]; Lynn, the home city of our own "BILL" CONNERY; Nashua, Manchester, Woonsocket, and Pawtucket.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] omitted to say that in his State they at least employ their own people. They did not import the people and put them to work in their mills. Why, it was because of importations of foreign labor into this country that we passed the contract-labor provisions in our immigration

laws, and principally because of what was done by the textile workers of New England.

Now, let us have it out. Let the lady from Lowell and the gentlemen from these other cities, which we all know so well, tell us what was the predominating language spoken in these cities 25 years ago. It was not English. Those people were fine, decent, religious, law-abiding, ambitious people, a credit to their communities, many of them rising to high place and becoming mayors and governors of some of those States, but their forefathers had been brought into New England by the textile magnates because of the low wages they could offer them and the long hours they could work them. So enough of that sectional talk.

DETAILS OF RELIEF SCALE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the schedule of monthly wages by regions and types of work specified in the Executive order that President Roosevelt issued the other day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following schedule of monthly wages by regions and types of work:

WORKS WAGES WILL VARY ACCORDING TO AREAS AND NATURE OF PROJECTS, UNDER PLAN OF ROOSEVELT

The schedule of monthly wages by regions and types of work specified in the executive order which President Roosevelt issued yesterday is as follows:

Counties in which the 1930 population of the largest municipality was—

UNSKILLED WORK

Region	Over 100,000	50,000 to 100,000	25,000 to 50,000	5,000 to 25,000	Under 5,000
I.....	\$55	\$52	\$48	\$44	\$40
II.....	45	42	40	35	32
III.....	35	33	29	24	21
IV.....	30	27	25	22	19

INTERMEDIATE WORK

I.....	\$65	\$60	\$55	\$50	\$45
II.....	58	54	50	44	38
III.....	52	48	43	36	30
IV.....	49	43	38	32	27

SKILLED WORK

I.....	\$85	\$75	\$70	\$63	\$55
II.....	72	66	60	52	44
III.....	68	62	56	48	38
IV.....	68	58	50	42	35

PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL WORK

I.....	94	83	77	69	61
II.....	79	73	66	57	48
III.....	75	68	62	53	42
IV.....	75	64	55	46	39

Regions include the following States:

- I. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.
- II. Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, West Virginia.
- III. Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia.
- IV. Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. Hook), for 10 days, on account of urgent business.

To Mr. OLIVER (at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 378. An act for the relief of Gerald Mackey;

H. R. 2045. An act to set aside certain lands for the Chipewewa Indians in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 6954. An act to authorize the transfer of the Green Lake Fish Cultural Station in Hancock County, Maine, as an addition to Acadia National Park; and

H. R. 7131. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 22, 1935:

H. R. 157. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 972. An act for the relief of John Costigan;

H. R. 1846. An act for the relief of Daniel W. Seal;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of Harry B. Walmsley;

H. R. 2294. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

H. R. 3721. An act for the relief of Angelo J. Gillotti;

H. R. 3975. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Georgia, at or near Sea Island Beach;

H. R. 4005. An act to amend section 21 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the time of making the annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission;

H. R. 4239. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.;

H. R. 5444. An act to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5707. An act to ratify and confirm the corporate existence of the city of Nome, Alaska, and to authorize it to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvement of its sewers and drains, fire-fighting systems, streets and alleys, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and a municipal building, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000;

H. R. 6021. An act to provide additional home-mortgage relief, to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and the National Housing Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6654. An act to increase the White House Police Force, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in June 1935.

On May 23, 1935:

H. R. 378. An act for the relief of Gerald Mackey;

H. R. 2045. An act to set aside certain lands for the Chipewewa Indians in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 6954. An act to authorize the transfer of the Green Lake Fish Cultural Station in Hancock County, Maine, as an addition to Acadia National Park; and

H. R. 7131. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(Saturday, May 25, 10:30 a. m.)

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives on Saturday, May 25,

1935, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7733 and H. R. 8057.

(Monday, May 27, 10:30 a. m.)

There will be an executive meeting of the Committee on Flood Control on Monday, May 27, 1935, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 6833.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6910. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933, enacted to safeguard the interests and welfare of Indians of the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex., in certain lands within the Carson National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7202. A bill to investigate the claims of and to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 7349. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREGORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 481. An act authorizing the filling of vacancies in certain judgeships; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8052; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8155) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Snyder, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FENERTY: A bill (H. R. 8178) to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8179) to amend an act entitled, "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 8180) to prohibit the use of the mails for the solicitation of the procurement of divorces in foreign countries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8181) to raise revenue by taxing certain wood pulp and pulpwood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 8182) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Delaware Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 8183) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at Emlenton, in the county of Venango, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 8184) to provide for the optional cash payment of adjusted-service certificates, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 8185) to amend section 201 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1928; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLAND (by request): A bill (H. R. 8186) to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 8187) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River, at Tionesta, in Tionesta Township, and in the county of Forest, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 8188) to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 8189) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at East Brady, in the counties of Clarion and Armstrong and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Resolution (H. Res. 228) for the consideration of S. 2530; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOOK: Resolution (H. Res. 229) directing the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) authorizing and directing the payment of the adjusted-service certificates of veterans out of the appropriation for public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 8190) granting a pension to Alice Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 8191) for the relief of Joseph P. Vesper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 8192) for the relief of Walter Edward Nolde; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 8193) for the relief of Noah Chambers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 8194) for the relief of H. Bluestone; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8195) authorizing the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Service Cross to Samson Goldstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8196) granting a pension to Thomas J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8198) for the relief of Dr. M. H. Streicher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8199) to provide a preliminary examination of the Huerfano River in Huerfano and Pueblo Counties, and the Cuchara River in Huerfano County, Colo., with a view to the control of their floods and the conservation of their waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8200) for the relief of the seamen of the steamship *Santa Ana*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8201) for the relief of the Freidell Winery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHER: A bill (H. R. 8202) for the relief of Eddie B. Black; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) for the relief of Mrs. Clifford D. Barber; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8204) to correct the military record of Waldo E. Cape; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8205) granting a pension to Viola E. Mann; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8590. By Mr. KING: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 2066, known as the "Frazier bill"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8591. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing and requesting the Secretary of Labor to appoint and send to the Territory of Hawaii a United States Labor Commissioner with full authority to perform the usual duties of a labor commissioner and to prepare the statistics called for in section 76 of the Hawaiian organic act; to the Committee on Labor.

8592. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to authorize the issuance of certain Territorial bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

8593. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide for the issuance, by the Bureau of Immigration of the Department of Labor, of certificates of citizenship to all persons residing in the Territory of Hawaii who are citizens of the United States and who apply for such certificates and present due proof of such citizenship, and to provide for the appointment of a commission to present this resolution before the Congress of the United States, and to make available to the said commission an appropriation to defray its expenses; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8594. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition concerning cooperation in the President's program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8595. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of members of the Second Interstate Assembly, urging that Congress support the proposed appropriation of \$40,000 to the Interstate Reference Bureau for the current year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8596. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York Federation of Music Clubs, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning House bill 7201; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8597. Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., concerning the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8598. Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, concerning the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8599. Also, telegram from E. P. Simmons, president of the Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York, favoring continuation of the National Recovery Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8600. Also, petition of Joseph A. Wynn Post, No. 260, Department of the State of New York, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Brooklyn, N. Y., endorsing House bill 5541; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8601. By Mr. TONRY: Petition of sundry citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of the State of New York, in disapproval of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8602. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress for the enactment of Federal legislation to substitute another tax for the discriminatory tax on cigarettes selling at a low price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Western Council of the Dress Manufacturing Industry, Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8604. Also, petition of the United Bondholders' Association, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.